DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 207 CS 200 691

AUTHOR	Barnes, Douglas; And Others
TITLE	Drama in English Teaching, Study Group Paper No. 2; Some Practical Considerations; Drama as Threat; From Dialogue to Other Forms of Discourse; About Drama and Composition; Report of Study Groups; Drama in Primary School; Drama Syllabus for Secondary School; and Drama: What is Happening.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.; National Association for the Teaching of English (England).; National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
PUB DATE	Sep 66
NOTE	110p.; Working papers of the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning (Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, Aug. 20-Sept. 16, 1966); For related documents see CS200684-690 and CS200692-200700
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Composition (Literary); Conference Reports; *Creative Dramatics; Curriculum Guides; *Drama; *Dramatics; Educational Innovation; *English Instruction; Oral English; Primary Grades; Secondary Education; *Teaching Techniques
IDENTIFIERS	*Dartmouth Seminar on the Teaching of English

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of these papers is to place drama and dramatic experiences within an overall conception of the activities of the English classroom. The initial paper discusses the English lesson as helping pupils to use their native language to deal with individual and group experiences. Drama, seen as part of the classroom use of oral language, may arise from a topic proposed by the teacher, a shared experience, or a work of literature. Drama, however, differs from other classroom talk in three ways: (1) movement and gesture play a larger part in the expression of meaning; (2) a group working together on an improvisation needs more deliberately and consciously to collaborate; and (3) the narrative framework allows for repetition and provides a unity that enables the action more easily to take on symbolic status. Subsequent papers in the set are titled: "Some Practical Considerations," "Drama as Threat," "From Dialogue to Other Forms of Discourse," "About Drama and Composition," "Drama in Education," "Drama," "Drama in Primary School," and "Drama Syllabus for the Secondary School." A preliminary version of a chapter on teaching discourse by dramatic methods, "Drama: What is Happening" by James Moffett, concludes the set. (TO)

ED 082207

STUDY GROUP PAPER NO. 2

Drama In English Teaching

by

Douglas Barnes

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Introductory

It will be the primary purpose of this paper to place drama and dramatic experiences within an overall conception of the activities of the English classroom. It takes as its premise that the central task of the English lesson--as opposed to English in other lessons--is to help the pupil to use his native language to deal with his experience both as an individual and as a participant in many different groups.

Talk in the English Classroom

Drama should be part of talk, the pervading medium of the English classroom. Clearly "talk" here demands definition, as it implies a hinterland of distinctions and assumptions which should be made explicit. "Talk" is used rather than "speech" or "discussion" to indicate that what is intended is the kind of hesitant, informal, joint exploration of topics--be they immediate to the pupils or distant--that is usual amongst adults when they approach an experience or a structure of ideas which they have not yet made fully articulate. Such talk is often highly synpraxic, dependent on subtlities of intonation and gesture, and amongst children tends to be less explicit in showing structural relationships than does their written language. At times it is anecdotal, or concerned with the joint recreation of an experience, and here gesture and movement are more and more important as the talk moves towards acting out the experience. As the children mature, the talk more often tends towards generalisation but never loses the possibility of moving back to the particular. It is through such talk that children can best find out in exchange with one another what are their responses to an experience, real or symbolic, and help one another to come to terms with it. Such talk does not occur in the classroom, however, without deliberate design; it is most likely when small groups of pupils talk about matters which engage their deepest attention. Nor will children talk in this way unless they feel that their responses and opinions are valued, and this has implications for the teacher's relationship with his pupils. Works of literature enter this

CS 300 691

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

talk as voices contributing to the conversation, and the talk in its turn provides a context for the literature, which helps the children to take in what the voices have to say. Furthermore, the talk allows the children to develop together their responses to the literature.

Drama and Talk

It is proposed, then, that drama should be seen as part of this classroom talk. Like all talk it may arise from a topic proposed by the teacher, from a shared experience such as an out of school visit, or from a work of literature, including a story or a poem. Drama, however, differs from other talk in three ways: movement and gesture play a larger part in the expression of meaning; a group working together upon an improvisation needs more deliberately and consciously to collaborate (which in itself has pedagogical implications); the narrative framework allows for repetition and provides a unity that enables the action more easily to take on symbolic status.

Drama as Symbol

It is this symbolic nature of dramatic activity which is perhaps its most specific characteristic; joint imporvisation within a situational framework requires the children to stylise speech and action, and this facilitates the process of symbolising. When we encourage pupils to write poems, we hope that they will discover how to organise the material of their own experience into a model--or image--which will have validity in organising diverse and distant experiences. Yet this happens very readily in drama; young children in their play present just such images of wide validity. It is useful to conceive children's dramatic activities--whether improvised or scripted--as varying along two dimensions: the material used may derive at one extreme from children's everyday experience and at the other extreme encompass literature based on material out of reach even of their imagination; the dramatic use made of the material will vary along another dimension according to the extent to which the action either remains a literal representation or finds symbolic value in the course of the acting. (A confusion of these dimensions often bedevils discussions of drama and of other creative activities when the term

"fantasy" is used indiscriminately of, on the one hand, activities far from the everyday, and, on the other, of those far from the literal.)

The Value of Dramatic Symbolising

It is perhaps now appropriate to attempt some statement of the value for the child of engaging in the group image-making of drama. Dramatic activities, including acting from a script, involve choice-making at several different levels. At the most literal level the pupils explore their experiences in the family, at school and with strangers; in doing so they re-experience and assimilate roles which they have already assumed, temporarily assume other roles, and participate in experiences at present out of reach. By assuming a role--taking upon stance, setting up a model--the child is trying out a version of himself and his possibilities without committing himself permanently, and, as in story-telling or poem-making, is both choosing and laying a basis for future choices of personality and values. The dramatic images set up have greater power in that unlike private fantasies they are the joint creation of a group, which thereby acknowledges their common validity. For many children the acting out in symbolic--and often very unrealistic--form of their fears, hatreds, and desires helps them to assimilate those which are too disturbing to be acknowledged literally. Moreover children, when at a maturer age they come to interpret a script, are involved in choicemaking, which though of a different kind may become quite as important.

From Dramatic Play to Drama

In describing some of the functions of drama for children, we have already implied that some changes take place as they develop; it now seems proper to look at this development. Before they reach school age, children occupy themselves for much of their time in dramatic play, either by manipulating some object to perform the dramatic activity or by themselves taking the dramatic role; such activities are usually accompanied by a flow of egocentric talk concerned not with communicating but with perceiving, planning, and symbolising. For most children this talk and play has become socialised by the time they begin school, and they then find satisfaction in the group dramatic play so typical of primary/elementary children.

It is through their talk that they are able to share the symbolic activities, but this language is at first synpraxic, only a small part of the total activity. During these years the typical sources of these symbols tend to be first the home (Mothers and Fathers, Funerals, etc.) and then--especially for boys--to move slowly away and to depend on symbols provided from without, on the one hand from folk tales (Kings and Queens, Witches, etc.) and on the other from the popular media (Cowboys and Indians, Daleks, etc.) What is taken over is, however, little more than the basic situation and some names and catchphrases which identify the roles. To an outsider who happens not to recognise the catchphrases, the play seems formless, repetitive, and of little meaning; it is not designed to communicate to outsiders, yet the intensity of its participants testifies to its significance for them. At this stage music can be of great value in generating new patterns of dramatic play. It is only later, perhaps from ten years onwards, that children begin--with adult encouragement--to be able to explore a situation more explicitly, so that their improvised dialogue and actions have public validity. As this power to make public the dramatic symbol increases, new classroom possibilities emerge, perhaps from twelve years onwards. First, it becomes possible to introduce scripts into the dramatic activities: the adult script provides what at an earlier stage is provided by folk tales or by the popular media, but it does so more explicitly. The teacher should aim to find scenes (or whole plays) which offer as powerful symbols as before, but which through their language give a more sensitive and orderly meaning to the dramatic activity. Secondly, at a more practical level, it is possible to ask pupils to recreate social situations using the appropriate language. By mid-adolescence the child's language abilities have developed far from the largely undifferentiated language of the pre-school years, and he has begun to specialise his language uses according to his purpose and situation. For those adolescents who are deprived of a wide range of social experience, dramatic recreation of realistic situations may be an important way of developing control of a range of registers. It is here suggested, however, that this should be subordinated to the symbolic function of

drama, primarily because drama may be, for many deprived children, the most important creative medium since it demands less verbal explicitness and is inseparable from expressive movement.

Drama within the English Whole

It now becomes appropriate to give further reasons for subsuming drama to an overall conception of English. Some schools in Britain timetable drama as a separate subject with its specialist teacher. It is a major intention of this paper to insist that the development of pupils through dramatic language and movement is not different in kind from development through other English activities, and that dramatic and non-dramatic work will be impoverished if there is not in the classroom an easy and immediate movement to and fro. For example, the talk of a class of able thirteen-year-olds began with a printed passage about a quarrel and moved from anecdote to generalisations about anger, its appearance and function; as some of the generalisations were unrealistic, the teacher invited the pupils to quarrel with one another in pairs and then to compare what they had observed. This led to further improvisations in which the teacher joined, but before long the class had stopped moving and were talking again at a general level; finally they wrote both about quarrels they had taken part in and about quarrels in general. What this is here intended to exemplify is the interrelatedness of a very wide range of learning through English. These varied activities in fact provided a context for the children's writing, but they might equally have been the context for their first approach to a literary work related to anger or quarrelling. And this literary work might have been a scene from a play, so that both the talk and the improvisation would have helped the children to enter imaginatively into it.

Scripted and Unscripted Drama

Such a classroom procedure, which moves from improvisation to the interpretation of a script, suggests a model for the relationship of the two. This is to reject another model in which the two activities are represented as different in kind, scripted drama as a form of literature to be approached only as audience and through the language of literary criticism, and unscripted drama as an activity related more

closely to expressive dance than to talk and concerned only with self-exploration and self-symbolisation. On the contrary, both make use of language and are social activities; self-exploration is in both cases a joint activity mediated by language and culminating in a group symbolisation. When a group of children is able to re-create a script as if it were their own improvisation, this is indeed self-exploration, though with the subtler aid of the dramatist's words. And it is improvisation that can help children to bring to a script those aspects of their real and imaginary experience which will enable them to recreate the dramatist's words as if they were their own. If a play is put into the hands of a group of children with no more than the instruction to "act" it, what they will do is likely to show little sign of an imaginative reconstitution of the script in voice and movement unless the class is accustomed to improvisation. And still less valuable is the over-academic approach which assumes the children's ability to experience the play and so moves straight from a "reading" of the text to impersonal literary critical comment, usually provided by the teacher. (The talk of a group of children who are engaged in interpreting a script may be for most of our pupils the most meaningful form of literary criticism.) In sum, it is proposed that if a play is to be meaningful to pupils it must be approached in ways that bring the activity closer to improvisation. And this remains true even for Sixth Form work, though at that stage once the play has been given imaginative life the students can progress to more objective discussion.

Improvisation in the Classroom

It is now possible to make some statements at a more practical level about the enabling conditions for classroom drama (and indeed for all creative work). The relationships between all the members of a class, and between each of them and the teacher, must allow the children to be unselfconscious enough to take on roles without embarrassment. They should feel that they are valued as people, that each of them has a valid contribution to make, and that they are not expected to subordinate their perceptions and needs to a pattern imposed by the teacher. This has implications for the teacher's conception of his role. The activities are at best controlled not by the arbitrary will of the teacher but by the need to

collaborate with other members of the group in activities which all find meaningful. A classroom in which children are prevented from leaving their desks and in which silence is enforced will not become immediately different at the word "acting." It is at Secondary level that a dogmatic and repressive classroom atmosphere is most likely to make drama impossible by indicating to the children that their teacher does not value what they have to give. Adolescent self-consciousness is another matter, as it is related to the child's uncertainty about his status with his peers; this happens more frequently with a class in which the children do not know one another well. The more the class works together in small groups, the less self-conscious they will become. However, a more immediate way of helping them is by beginning a lesson with individual activities which do not involve role-playing and which are intended only for the pupil himself and his teacher, not for an audience. The teacher can ask a class scattered about a large room to engage in an impersonal activity (such as miming the unwrapping of a large parcel); once the pupils can lose themselves in this solo activity it is possible to move on to work in pairs and then in groups, introducing, once the pupils have gained confidence, activities which require language and role-playing. The solo miming may be of limited value in itself since at the Secondary stage it is unlikely to become symbolic, but it is valuable as a way of introducing controlled actions. Boys in particular find pleasure in violently uncontrolled actions, and it becomes necessary to require them to control these movements and adjust them to group activities.

From Improvisation to Script

Once children of Secondary age have become able to involve themselves fully in improvised drama, it becomes possible to introduce scripts. The re-creating of a dramatic script is not so different from improvisation as it might appear, and similar methods may be used to help children achieve them in the classroom. In our everyday living it is from our awareness of the verbal and non-verbal context that we choose intuitively the vocal patterns of intonation and emphasis and the physical gesture in which we embody our meaning; similarly in improvised drama we make these choices intuitively. When faced with a script the child is likely to "read" it,

that is, make relatively neutral choices which demonstrate his uncertainty of the role and of the situation which gives meaning to the role. This is not a mere technical failure, but a failure to imagine himself inside the dramatic situation, a failure--and this is the essential point--to recreate it as a work of literature. What the teacher must aim to do, therefore, is to set up a situation in which the pupils' insight into the nature of the dramatic situation enables them to make intuitively the appropriate choices of voice and movement. This is exactly analoguous to the provision of a context of talk for a poem or a prose work. The required insight will arise from classroom talk and improvisation about a situation related to that of the scene to be acted: once the class has begun to act out the situation in an inward way--once it has become a joint symbol for them-- it is possible for the teacher to introduce the scripts so that existing insight will enable the pupils to recreate the printed words intuitively.

Two Examples

For example, a class of thirteen year olds was asked to improvise in pairs a squabble between a man and his supercilious wife who leaves in a huff, to act (alone) a mixture of fear and determination in approaching a growling dog, to fondle and talk to it, and to improvise some other situations closely related to the Prologue of Shaw's Androcles and the Lion. When these improvisations had been practised, shown to one another, and talked about, the children worked in threes upon a short section of the Prologue, acting it with scripts, putting down the scripts and improvising dialogue, watching other groups act, and discussing first the intonations and movements and then by a natural progression the nature of what was being presented. When they finally acted the whole Prologue in groups, this slight and conventional episode came to life because it was filled out with perceptions of their own. On another occasion a class of fifteen-year-olds was reading Shakespeare's Henry V and showed no insight when they read the scene in the French camp before Agincourt. The teacher stopped them and asked them what was happening in the scene. In their answers the pupils showed that at one level they understood that the rival French nobles were engaged in politely ill-natured banter, and they suggested that this sometimes occurred at ladies' tea-parties and with men waiting

to be interviewed for a job. They improvised such scenes, and then read the Shakespeare scene with a much more inward understanding which showed itself in voice and movement. What is here asserted is that a play does not consist of marks on a page but of voices and movements, and that when the pupils themselves are able to recreate whose voices and movements they are moving towards a full possession of such literature.

The Whole Play

So far in this paper, classroom drama has been discussed as if it were to confine itself to single scenes. This assumes that it is more valuable to the children to participate imaginatively in one scene than to aim for a rapid reading of a whole play which will leave them with little more than the story-line. But when the pupils, and especially the more able ones, reach mid-adolescence, it becomes possible to help them to some appreciation of a whole play. Major scenes may be prepared by different groups in advance and then the whole performed with a linking commentary. Or the class may work in pairs or larger groups on the most important scenes, and the linking scenes may be read by the best actors who have been given scripts in advance. By such methods as these a compromise may be made between allowing the pupils time to enter imaginatively into some scenes and the need to move fast enough to give them a sense of the whole. Beyond this comes the fully-produced play in which pupils learn their parts by heart and practice each scene many times. This can be of great educative value when the interpretation is allowed to arise in the pupils' growing insight; but too often (at least in Britain) the teacher's awareness of a future audience leads him to impose his own interpretation in a less valuable way. It seems likely that a satisfactory experience of a whole play will seldom arise in the classroom, and that herein lies the great importance of the class visit to a theatre, preferably to see a play of which some parts have already been recreated in the classroom. There are, besides, groups of actors who specialise in presenting to schools plays in which the audience can participate, and this is probably more valuable to younger children than to join the more passive audience in a theatre.

The Choice of Scripts

If the need to help older pupils to recreate scripts for themselves is held to be paramount, it is clear that plays chosen for classroom use must involve situations within the pupils' imaginative range, especially those which find symbols for such common experiences as conflict between father and son, isolation in a crowd, guilt, standing up for one's principles, and finding a mate. Plays whose dialogue is looseiy naturalistic are to be avoided, since these pin the drama to an alien "here and now"--often socially alien--and by their prosaic diffuseness hinder the action from becoming a symbol for the pupils. Certain plays of Shakespeare answer these requirements best, yet the language makes it difficult to introduce these early without losing the children's imaginative participation. (However, at quite an early age children who are used to expressive movement to music can be asked to mime evil witch movements singly, in pairs, and then in threes, so that, when they have habituated their voices to the first scene of Macbeth, they can put their books aside and combine dance-drama with Shakespeare's words.) The work of other dramatists can be used as only partly satisfactory substitutes with children not quite ready for Shakespeare; versions of highly stylised medieval plays can be very useful. What are most to be avoided are the books of trifling and banal one-act plays in prose (very common in British schools until recently). When they re-create scripts of the highest quality, the children are taking over not only the dramatist's symbolism but the language in which it is couched, a language of much subtler allusiveness and organisation than they could improvise.

Some Practical Considerations

The object of this paper is to try to raise some of the questions affecting the practical implementation of the drama programme in schools and in particular to deal with the problem of the inexperienced teacher in this field. The method adopted is to begin by some general practical considerations and then to consider one or two examples of the kind of work that can actually be expected in a classroom at different grade levels.

The Conditions for Drama Work. Ideally when children arrive in the secondary school at Grade 7 one would suppose that a tradition of work in drama has already been established. In practice one cannot make this assumption: the shades of the prison house do indeed close about us in our infancy and many of the children even at this stage will have had their experience in school closed to the kind of physical and imaginative experience that drama provides. The same is true of a large number of our teachers who, to some extent, may be said to be disqualified by their training in school and university for any real imaginative experience or work with children. Ideally with a trained class and teacher one ought to be able to suppose that drama permeates the whole activity of the classroom; in practice it seems to me that one has to legislate for less than this.

At Grades 7 and 8, therefore, there is something to be said for a designated drama period, though even here as will emerge later there must always be concern to build what is done in such a period into the normal pattern of the English programme which is being currently followed. However in many

schools the classroom for reasons of space and sound is not the best place in which to conduct these lessons and it may be necessary to timetable a hall for use for drama work at a specific period in the working week. Equally it is important that the children develop certain routines from the very beginning: drama is concerned with ritual and the establishment of a ritual in connection with drama lessons is very valuable. Boys for example should remove their coats without needing to be told to do so; there should be recognized procedures for beginning and stopping activities, e.g., a code of signals on a tambor. Building this kind of control into the pattern of the lessons from the first is important since drama is essentially concerned with control: for this reason the teacher who is having discipline trouble may if anything find that the problem is eased by work of this kind. But the especially valuable thing here is that the control comes from within and as a function of the activity itself; it is not something imposed from without.

Ideally there would be a hall always available for the English teachers for use not only for drama work but for other kinds of group activities, discussions, etc. and one which was properly equipped with rostra that could be used as adjuncts to the activity taking place: the conference should go on record as requiring that teachers of English be given the proper physical conditions in which to carry out their work.

The Question of "Sequence": It is important that planning of each stage of the programme takes place by the teacher concerned with implementing it: in addition the good teacher must be an opportunist, snatching at particular opportunities as they present themselves. Three considerations of "sequence"

come in here: i) the individual drama lesson must itself be structured; there should be a clear and discernable pattern in what is done in the classroom; the children should emerge feeling that something has been achieved - and also that they have enjoyed themselves; ii) this lesson must ideally have relevance to a wider context of the work on which these children are engaged in English - it is not an isolated activity; iii) it needs also to relate to a wider school sequential programme in drama having its basis in both the curve of child development and the whole pattern of the English programme within the school - an example of one scheme of work of this kind has already been produced. It must be emphasized that the alternative to a fully structured programme is not chaos and that mediocre teachers only become better by being trusted and encouraged, not by providing them with teacher-proof materials.

Some classroom examples:

1. Grade 7: early in the school year. A class of middle range ability (mixed ability)

It is assumed that these children have had some experience of drama by now in the secondary school: the basic routines have been established as described above, but they are still relatively unsophisticated in this work.

As the class arrives a certain amount of "free activity" takes place: children will remove outer clothing such as coats and wander around talking and moving freely in the hall where the lesson takes place. A few minutes after the start of the lesson the teacher gives a pre-arranged signal (a strike on the tambor / for example) and the class comes to order. These

children are still unaware of their bodies and their potentiality for bodily control: we begin therefore with a group exercise to develop this. The children (assuming a class of 30) are divided quickly and roughly into three groups and practice moving about within a confined area, weaving in and out of each other but avoiding touching each other. This movement exercise which will be developed later in the lesson is continued for a short space of time only before being brought to a stop by a signal on the tambor. Other kinds of movement activities can then take place either individually or in groups, e.g., clapping of hands to tambor beats in such a way as to explore the area of space around them; playing imaginary games of table tennis in pairs to a background of music (e.g., Les Paul: Nola - a useful piece of guitar music). The object of this kind of activity is to provide a limbering up period, to free the child from the lingering remnants of the math period from which he has just come, perhaps; to encourage awareness of space and the use of the body to explore and control it. Not more than five or ten minutes are devoted to this kind of work.

Next the teacher collects the whole class around him: they sit easily and comfortably, but alertly, on the floor around him. Talk now takes place. A story is told, or may be extrapolated from the class itself: a situation is built up. Assuming a town environment for the children one may talk about the kind of people to be found in the street on a busy Saturday: the varying activities that go on, the heterogeneous collection of individuals and groups of individuals. As much detail as possible is put into this talk as the common experience of the class is drawn upon and as many members of the group

as possible are encouraged to share their experiences with the others; gradually a situation arises in which each member of the class is encouraged to assume the role of someone in a street on a busy Saturday afternoon - some will be separate individuals, e.g., shopkeepers, others will be part of a family out for a walk, etc., etc. The whole group now enacts the street scene, each child playing his/her role to its own satisfaction and responding as necessary to the roles being assumed by the other children. Suddenly the teacher injects a new stimulus: a sharp bang on the tambor perhaps with the accompanying information that a stone has just been thrown through a shop window over there: how do you react? Each child individually, or as part of the group with which he is working, reacts appropriately: the scene can then be "frozen" and the situation and its implications discussed. From here it is possible to send the children away in smaller groups (as at the beginning of the lesson) to work out through first discussion and then "trying it out" in action "what happens next" - each group can take the simple basic situation and work upon it to produce a kind of improvised drama. Finally after having spent as long upon the exercise as seems useful the teacher can suggest that each child, still enacting its role, returns home, tired after the excitements of the day, goes inside and sits down in an armchair and completely relaxes, so that the lesson ends on a note of absolute quiet and relaxation - necessary physically and psychologically for the children after a period of activity of this kind, and enabling the possibility of moving to work in a different dimension afterwards.

Assuming that this work has taken place when a double period (in U.K. about 30 minutes) is available the class might now move to where it normally meets to write. After a brief further discussion of what has gone on various kinds of written assignments arise: e.g., character sketches based upon the people in the street scene, describing what happened in the role of spectator or participant, describing it from several points of view, contrasting the policeman's notebook viewpoint with that of the small boy in the crowd - different aspects of this can then be assigned to different members of the class, having regard to their individual range of achievement in written work, and can then be begun in what remains of the lesson to be finished for home-work, which will lead into the next lesson's work which probably begins with some sharing and discussion, as a class or in groups, of the written work, and which may develop in all manner of ways: e.g., the hunting ... (?) anthologies and the reading of poems on the street-scene theme and/or the mounting of a display, the making of a tape (a radio broadcast about the incident perhaps), or some other way of consolidating and "publishing" the work done so far. (The possibilities of "fieldwork" too should not be ignored, going out and observing what does in fact happen in the main street on a Saturday afternoon; taking out a portable tape recorder to conduct on-the-spot interviews etc.) A whole series of lessons over a period of time can grow out of an introductory activity of the kind described; though equally well if it has failed to capture the imagination, it may be necessary to drop it and turn to something else. (The remaining exercises will of necessity have to be described in much less detail but it should be emphasized that the same

kind of pattern underlies them, i.e., they are not isolated but relate to a total programme in which the class is engaged.*)

2. GRADE 10

a) Dramatic play and exercises. At this stage it is important to retain the element of "play," to continue to encourage freedom of movement and action, while at the same time a rather more sophisticated attitude to the activity of drama may be expected. I have already described verbally the "penny passing" game that I have found useful here and the "status game" that has interesting implications for drama work in comedy especially; another aspect of this is for one student to sit on a bench while another approaches him and projects an image into him, i.e., decides what kind of person he or she is and by his reaction, words, and gestures enables the first student, who began by having had a neutral personality, to assume a role in a scene which they play out together. This kind of more sophisticated exercise is an analogue to the limbering up exercises described in example one above.

b) Literature through improvisation. Again this may well be part of a much wider programme. A 10th grade class of mine last year was doing a project based upon the Seven Deadly Sins which were being investigated in seven groups - with some competition for the more interesting sins; it seemed a good moment to introduce them to Moliere. I happened to have only Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme available (a useful text at this stage), though it would not have been the most obvious choice. It is however valuable as it splits into

a number of disparate scenes, which can be treated almost in isolation, and also involves a number of the most basic situations of farce. We began by my describing some of the opening scenes and the students themselves improvising dramatically and writing about such situations; we proceeded later to each group being given a text and choosing a scene to rehearse and interpret, leading eventually to a showing and a sharing of what had beer worked out practically: this was at once a valid experience in itself and also a much more real critical activity than any abstraction or analysis based upon the text alone; ideally it would be followed up by a visit to a good production of another Moliere play. (The drama teacher needs to know his local theatres well and to construct some aspects of his programme with their performances in mind.)

c) The role of film. The same 10th grade group participated in the series of lessons I have described verbally where a film, Tous lesgarcons s'Appellent Patrick, was the starting point and led to some very interesting dramatic improvisations and an adaptation of a film situation in a totally different social mores to their own situation and culture. Indeed dramatic imitation is a very valuable way into film discussion: the "heroics" of the war film of the Alan Ladd variety show up for what they really are when translated into a different context for example; on the other hand the Godard film benefitted by this treatment and the children came to a second showing with a heightened awareness and enjoyment. (On this see the article by Albert Hunt in the NATE Bulletin on "Literature and English Literature.")

It should be emphasized that the 10th grade class discussed here was well experienced in both film and drama work and that the class together and

inter-class relationships were excellent. Work of the kind that they were able to undertake could only come about through a continual experience of the kind I have been describing from the 7th grade upwards and itself was a demonstration of the possibilities of "growth" in this medium.

One could go on multiplying examples ad. lib. of this kind of work at different levels but this paper is already too long and the point has been established by now that one seeks to educate through drama rather than in drama, that in structuring one's programme for a class the concern is to let drama grow into other things and to let other things grow into drama. Continually the concern is to bring children back into touch with the realities that lie behind words and to lead them through sense and physical experience to explore the complexities of the world of things and relationships in which they are involved; to try out roles in the security afforded by the mask that drama provides; and, cognately, to explore language also as a means of coming to terms with that experience. In a school environment which is mainly verbal in its culture drama seems to me an absolutely essential counterbalance to what is otherwise a very one-sided development: it may save our children from a great deal of what has happened to us.

Two other points briefly:

Speech and Drama: In example (1) above, the street scene could clearly have been played out in mime or in words. My experience would suggest that at the beginning of this kind of work mime is often valuable as a discipline and also as a means of concentration upon one thing at a time - but speech will

come and should be encouraged and accepted at the point where it naturally develops out of the situation. Drama has clear links, as Douglas has shown us, with the experience of talk, but we ought not to subordinate it to talk, not to use it as some teachers have done simply as a kind of under-cover speech training. This is a point that needs explaining especially to school principals.

The School Play. Equally we must never allow our drama lessons to become the servant of the image of the school that the authorities wish to project through the medium of the school play. Ideally the play should grow out of a "drama workshop" type of organization and should be an ensemble production; it should be an entertainment provided for and by the children, not a means of enabling a teacher to fulfill his own frustrated desire to be a producer nor simply a prestige making offering by the Headmaster. If this is to be the school play then the English Department wants no part in it.

I have not written here of tertiary stage education in drama because I have no direct personal experience of it, but I know that it is being done, and most successfully, along these lines. It seems to me to be even more necessary there than earlier, if possible; so far from play and dramatic role-playing becoming less important as the child grows older, they become ever more essential to his full development. I think that the theoretic formulations that we have reached over the last few days will justify this point of view. This also leads to a selection of a number of texts for these older children which are especially useful because they consciously involve this element of role-playing: I would suggest a great deal of the work of Brecht and Arden, and also the plays of Max Frish, as amongst the texts which ought to be in every English stockroom.

"In short, drama, along with poetry and the other arts, is not a 'frill' which the less able can safely omit or relegate to a minor position on some Friday afternoons. Art is not an expensive substitute for reality. It is through creative arts, including the arts of language, that young people can be helped to come to terms with themselves more surely than by any other route.

It is a matter of some concern that the educative experience of drama in all its forms is too often... restricted or denied to pupils."

(The Newson Report Paras. 479.480)

Drama as Threat

As a teacher I have seen pupils blossom or shrink in dramatic activities. We must acknowledge our powerlessness in controlling the dramatic interplay. In the playground the pupils are finding their groups and sub-groups - or their isolation - and taking up roles within them that provide some security and protection. But in the drama room we break down these temporary stabilities and safeties and make the children try other roles. Those who can will grow, but what of those who are not yet ready? In the playground they can escape from the intolerable situation, but not in our drama lesson. So we risk serious harm to them.

It is the isolate who is most likely to be harmed. The children who will not associate with him in the playground will let him know by the sneer or the turned back that he is not wanted in the acting group. The child used only to adults will not be able to join in the group's image-building; his own inner dialogue will be couched in language and shaped into myths too different from theirs. The deprived child and the child with the minority accent will be rejected yet again (or confined to comic or class-defined roles which will limit, not extend, his conception of the roles open to him in life). The boy with the breaking voice or the clumsy manner will once again be laughed at, rather than laughed with. For the outsider drama is likely to reenforce his sense of failure and rejection.

We say that drama will extend the roles that a child can choose from, but what of those children who are always given the same kind of role? The

tall heavy girl in the girls' school will always be cast as a man, and this will strengthen her already slightly masculine role in her relationships with other girls. The pretty boy in the boys' school play will have his feminine characteristics underlined. The careless teacher will say, "We want a really ordinary person for this part.... Susan, you'll be just right for it." And another girl will find herself repeatedly throughout her school career cast as a nasty old woman, from the witch in the fairy tale to the witch in Macbeth. This is not education but constriction, the drama lesson reimforcing the group's pressure on the child to conform to an imposed role.

The older student who has found a role in life may refuse to risk his hard-won security by joining in drama. For some pupils the impersonality of the scientific mode may be a life-style which, although inadequate by some standards of self-awareness, is essential to their stability. Even if they try to act, they will probably fail to enter the part. Do they not have the right to refuse? Should we ask them?

Clearly the drama teacher must always be ready to allow pupils to step aside and watch, though this, too, increases their isolation. At best he can find some administrative task which will involve the pupil in the group's activity until he feels ready to join in. Improvisation by creating a fluid social situation strengthens the self-assertive and weakens the insecure. The teacher must be vigilant to minimise this.

On Soliloquy

Though theatrical convention and necessity require that it be voiced, a soliloquy is supposed to be unuttered thoughts, self-verbalization. Soliloquizing is thinking. At least as early as Henri Bergson and William James, psychologists have suggested that thought is inner speech. The notion has been subscribed to since by the social psychologist George Herbert Mead and by an impressive roster of contemporary specialists in learning theory and child development that includes Piaget, Vygotsky, Luria, and Bruner. The general concept is that most of our thinking, the verbal part, is a kind of unvoiced conversation with oneself. After acquiring speech socially, through interaction with other people, the child begins to distinguish between the speech he utters for himself and the speech he utters for others. At first he voices aloud all speech, typically failing, in his egocentricity, to discriminate talking to himself and talking to another. Once he does discriminate, this early "egocentric speech" splits into internal and external discourse. Both are instrumental but have different functions: internal speech serves to process information as a guide to action; external speech serves to communicate. The earlier egocentric speech is a "thinking out loud," a running accompaniment to play and thus probably not distinguished by the child from his other bodily actions. Part of this patter is simply a verbal encoding of physical things, and part is planning and self-direction--all of which he later inhibits because it is not socially adaptive, and may even be socially detrimental if uttered aloud. In shunting some of his own speech underground, the child is in effect

internalizing the words, forms, and ideas of other people, since he learned them by imitation and interaction. Anyone can observe for himself some of the stages of this internalization. A child will tell himself aloud--in perhaps his parents' exact words--that "we should not touch the vase." Children thinking about a task can be seen to move their lips, so that an experienced lipreader can tell what they are thinking as they verbally meditate the task.

It is not generally acknowledged just how much the social medium of exchange and the chief instrument of thought are one and the same--language. Outer and inner speech reciprocally determine each other; they are a serpent with its tail in its mouth. What needs emphasis, however, is thought as the internalization of social processes. Self and mind are social artifacts, and the constituents of the self are the constituents of society; thought involves incorporating the roles and attitudes of others and addressing oneself internally as one would another.

Reflected in Hamlet's soliloquies are various 'voices' of his culture, society, class, and family--belief systems, attitudes, points of view, and roles. These could be personified and each assigned certain lines from his soliloquies, thus creating an external dialogue. Hamlet is full of voices, ghosts. So is Willy Loman. And so are we all. Consider what it means when we say "I keep telling myself. . .," "I debated with myself. . .," "I talked myself into. . .," and so on. Biologically each of us is a whole; only cognitively and culturally can we be split into speaker and listener.

To consider the same issue in reversal, the whole of a play may be considered as a soliloquy by the playwright, who is ventriloquizing. A

playwright says what he has to say not through a monologue but through a colloquy of created voices. The ensemble of these voices externalizes his mind. This kind of ventriloquizing amounts to fractionating the total voice production of which he is capable, to breaking down his self into the many points of view, attitudes, and roles which actually and potentially comprise it. The failure of young readers to appreciate Dickens' caricatures, and the failure of critics to 'understand' Waiting for Godot, stems from an insistence that each character be a whole person and that the characters are embodied tendencies and potentialities of that person. Becket's Gogo and Didi, Pozzo and Lucky, are components of personality, paired. If a play works, communicates, it is because the same social forces that have installed voices in the author have also installed them in the spectator. Whether the playwright is sociological like Shaw, psychological like Strindberg, or both like Arthur Miller, the characters tend to speak as both personality components and as social forces. In After the Fall Miller finally completed a technical innovation begun by O'Neil in Emperor Jones, Tennessee Williams in The Glass Menagerie, and himself in Death of a Salesman; by exploiting the incorporation process for the very form of his play, he made the stage a peopled head.

Although we customarily regard thought as private and internal, it is in many respects really very impersonal and external. Original permutations of thought is a socially forged instrument. The abstractive structures we are born with are open and flexible and may, as research in anthology and cognitive styles shows, produce very different abstractions in different groups.

It is from his groups that the individual learns these particular ways of cognizing and verbalizing. In view of this, a pedagogy based on provoking or eliciting thought presupposes that a child is already capable of generating the required kinds of thoughts. Asking 'stimulating' questions and assigning 'stimulating' reading invites the student to put out but does not give him anything, as teachers of the disadvantaged know well. In order to generate thoughts a student must have previously internalized some discursive operations that he can use as tools. Elicitation has a place certainly at some stage of instruction, but more basic is to create the kinds of social discourse that when internalized become the kinds of cognitive instruments called for by later tasks. The failure of disadvantaged students to think and talk White Anglo-Saxon Protestant Middle Class prose stems obviously from their not having been talked to and within the way White Anglo Saxon Protestant Middle Class people talk to and with their children. But even the most advantaged child will never escape the cognitive limitations of family, class, social role, etc. unless the school provides him a kind of discursive experience to internalize that is different from what he internalized at home. The cranium is the globe, but the globe any child grows up in is always too small for later purposes, especially in civilization as we know it and are increasingly going to know it.

"From Dialogue To Other Forms of Discourse"

The sharpening of thought, the elaboration of sentence structures, and the increased use of functor words such as prepositions, conjunctions, and interpretive adverbs--all develop together. Outside the classroom this development through vocal exchange occurs all the time, but in the classroom it can be furthered deliberately by creating kinds of dialogue in which questioning, qualifying, and collaborating are habitual give-and-take operations.

I am asking the reader to associate dialectic with dialogue. The internal conversation we call thinking recapitulates previous utterances as amended and expatiated on. The social actions underlying vocal exchange have counterparts in the forms of language--in the functor words and their entailed constructions. Additives represent agreement; adversatives, contradiction; concessives, provisos, and conditionals, a degree of acceptance and a degree of resistance. Constructions of time, place, manner, are born of when, where, and how questions motivated by the listener's desire to get more information from his speaker. Because is born of why; so of so what. The creation of relative clauses and the insertion of 'signal words' like however, moreover, and therefore stem from a felt need to relate statements for the benefit of the listener. The way the speaker becomes aware of this need is through questions of clarification or other feedback indicating the listener does not understand the relations among items or statements in the utterance. Although a child might come to use some functors and subordinate clauses just by sheer imprinting--stylistic imitation--I think it is safe to say

that such learning would never go far or deep without the functional need for qualification and transformation arising in dialogue. This is why I do not think exercises with isolated sentences, no matter how superior the grammar, will teach students how to use various linguistic constructions appropriately and habitually. The expatiation process of dialogue adjusts speaker's verbal and cognitive instruments at just the moment when he cares most and in just the way that he, individually, needs the adjustment.

The first movement away from dialogue is monologue, by which I mean the sustained, connected speech of the sort the term designates in the theater.

Monologue is the bridge from dialogue to other forms of discourse. It is the beginning of a speech less moored to circumstance and audience, that floats more freely in time and space. It moves closer to organization and composition. It is the pathway to writing. And yet, ultimately, every monologue has some dialogue for its context, from which it issues. Among monologues the critical distinction is between the face-to-face vocalizations, which are extemporaneous and very sensitive to audience presence and to circumstances of utterance, and written monologues, which are planned and composed in relative detachment from audience and circumstances. Further, among written monologues themselves there are degrees of composedness and detachment: consider a scale going from kinds of private, occasional writing such as letters, memos, and diaries to duplicated and published writing directed at an increasingly widespread audience.

If the teacher imagines a continuum going from the one extreme of stychomythia to the other extreme of the polished solo publication, he has

then an instrument of great pedagogical value. For the gradations of the continuum are steps in a natural evolution from dialogue to written composition. A curriculum sequence and a recurring, lesson sequence can be based on these gradations that will lead the student from conversation to vocal monologue to casual writing to formal writing. Many significant variables are at play in such a sequence. Improvisation becomes composition gradually--by extending over time and space the circumstances of the discoursing act, by making the audience larger and more remote, and by slowing down the feedback. As we move along this path the gap widens between thought and utterance, for our vocal speech more nearly resembles our spontaneous thought than our writing does. But the first step toward writing is made when a speaker takes over a conversation and sustains some subject alone. He has started to create a solo discourse that while intended to communicate to others is less collaborative, less prompted, and less corrected by feedback than dialogue. He bears more of the responsibility for effective communication. He has moved away from drama toward narrative, exposition, and theory--the domains of writing. He has started to enchain his utterances according to some logic. The cues for his next line are not what his interlocutor said but what he himself just said.

I am saying that a curriculum should afford the student a rich experience in not only the right kinds of conversation but also in the variety of vocal and written monologues that bridge into full-fledged public composition. The most critical adjustment one makes is to relinquish collaborative discourse, with its reciprocal prompting and cognitive cooperation, and to go it alone. The

first going it alone can be simply an extended utterance within a conversation. A very important issue of psychological independence is involved. This is a major reason why so many students--even adolescents--who can converse for hours claim they have "nothing to say" when asked to write. Forsaking the interrogative and imperative modes for declaration eliminates a lot of discourse that a child is most familiar with. Add to this the well known fact that an enormous amount of conversation is social communion, establishing and maintaining solidarity, and has little to do with developing a subject, which in fact is sometimes a pretty indifferent matter. Add further that having to develop a real subject, alone, means employing one or more of the monological orders of statement. Where does the student find such things? Only in himself of course. And how do they get there? They get there through internalization of previous dialogues . . . .

About Drama and Composition

Two points only: the first is that your good writer is your wide and various man: a character nicely conscious of the elements of personhood excluded by this or that act of writing and ever in a half-rage to allude to them: to hint at characterological riches even where these can't be spent. Thus the sin of wit in some grave prayers, and simultaneities of exaltation and muck in Pope or Swift. Our cheap quick lit crit deals with these signs of human variousness under the rubric Irony and thereby misses all. What we truly have in good writing is a moment to moment embodiment of the breathing contradictoriness of a living mind: we are given vouchers of variousness. I, the writer says, I know my emotional fullness, I know the range of thinking and feeling in theory not "permitted" in this piece: I shall wink and wink and you too will see. And the sight will freshen you to endure argument.

Truisms, truisms. But bad student writing, bad MLA issues, bad working papers: these are bad usually because the writer does not know or will not tolerate his own variousness in his prose. He has not learned to relish his power to project a life of feeling, he is in a word undemonstrative. Teaching that goes endlessly back to the task of showing the student his potential life of feeling is teaching that goes against the bonedry sentences of juiceless self-reduced man. And it is this sort of teaching that becomes possible when drama moves toward the center of the English classroom.

The other point more quickly: exposition, analysis, capacity to Get It Right, establishing precision as a value and so on, and so on. The drama

class becomes the place where the talk aims at naming a feeling, sets of feeling in their relations, complications and contradictions of human response. I am aware of a widespread and ignorant conviction that only the mindless can speak with interest about details of feeling. But consider: what person who has once sought intensely and responsibly to know his own feelings in a particular situation could accept an account of the enterprise as intellectually unchallenging? The surest proof of the excruciating difficulty of achieving full consciousness of one's own or another's responses is the rarity of effort toward the end: it is much easier to settle for public cant and private self-deception than to reach for human innerness.

In sum: the talk and the set assignments in the drama class are never undisciplined: they "teach" truths of variousness and animation, and they teach the urgency of verbal adequacy to the object. A fair way, I thought, to begin to learn to write.

Report of Study Group 2
Drama in Education

1. There is a sense in which all effective teaching in the classroom situation is dramatic by its very nature. The relationship within the classroom is a dynamic one; there is a constant interplay between the teacher and the class and also between members of the class itself. This is a group situation and the relationships that are set up in it develop strong dramatic overtones. Thus learning becomes not just a matter of the imparting and receiving of instruction, but a corporate activity in which the teacher is drawing out of the members of the class what they have to contribute to the learning situation; it is an orchestration rather than a solo performance by the teacher on his dais. One of the reasons why drama is so valuable an activity educationally is that it enables the teacher to capitalize on this inherent characteristic of the classroom; it is in fact one of the most natural ways in which effective teaching can take place--through it the classroom becomes an ensemble.

2. We have had this very much in mind in the discussions of the Group. But we have also addressed ourselves in practical detail to the problems of carrying out work in drama in the classroom. We recognize that there are considerable differences between British and American practices here and that what is variously called "free drama" or "creative dramatics" does not usually extend beyond the seventh grade in American schools. This fact was regretted and it was felt that this was an area in which something could be learned from British experience. (It needs to be said, however, that this

work is by no means universal in Great Britain and the many schools, especially the grammar schools, have much to learn themselves of the value of this work.)

3. It is important to distinguish between drama, and the literary study of dramatic texts. The first is our main concern here and represents a particular form of classroom drama growing largely out of improvisation; we are interested in the education of children in English through drama, not in the production of trained actors and actresses. The concept of "playing to an audience" is irrelevant to a large part of our concerns, and there may indeed be times in classroom drama where an audience is a hindrance or a positive danger. Thus it is drama at the level of the individual or the group rather than primarily at the level of public presentation, which we call theatre, with which we are concerned.

4. The papers written by Arthur Eastman and Ben de Mott summarize our insistence upon the important and central role of drama in the English curriculum. We would stress that in its emphasis upon things before words; in its capacity for keeping open a wide-ranging series of choices for the individual pupil; in its ability to grapple with the complexity of relationships in a group and dynamic situation, drama provides an invaluable corrective to the otherwise verbally dominated culture of the school. It offers the opportunity of new modes of communication of a non-verbal level which is especially valuable to the child whose verbal endowment is at first limited: through experiments with situations in drama he may come to a conceptualization of them which can lead forward to their exploration in verbal terms.

This we see as being no less important for the verbally gifted also. It is from them, to put it at its lowest, that the future generation of teachers will be very largely drawn; if today we suffer from an over-academic education of our teachers, we perpetuate this if we deny to our most capable pupils a full participation through education in drama: there seems to us little doubt that one of the benefits of this work is the element of "release" that it gives to pupils from what might otherwise be a hide-bound and constrictive educational situation. This freedom, we believe, comes to inform the rest of their work, in speech and in writing, with a vitality and vigor that it is difficult to replace. (To use Basil Bernstein's terminology it may be that drama provides a valuable first means of enabling children to move from a restricted to an elaborated code, and this can be of equal value for all our pupils.)

Moreover the element of "role-playing" in drama, the assumption of a mask, provides valuable experience in empathy which can extend the child's ability to handle situations and which can also inform and extend the range of registers he is capable of handling in written and spoken English. The experience with a variety of "voices" which work in drama entails can also lead to a more adequate and sensitively aware reading of literature, including non-dramatic literature. Literature becomes, in fact, a further "voice" introduced into the dramatic situation of the classroom.

5. Drama is capable of providing a sequential and developing curriculum. One example of such a curriculum is attached, not as a model but as an indication of what can be done in practice. We see it as important that the

work in drama is continuous throughout the English course and that it extends into the secondary and tertiary stages of education as well as the primary.

6. We do not regard the appointment of specialist teachers of drama as meeting our requirements. Work in drama is necessarily an integral part of the total English programme which is a continuum and not to be fragmented. Unless the work in English unites dramatics, oral and written work, much of its value as an educative process will be lost. The paper entitled "Some Practical Considerations" gives examples of how this integration can be achieved.

7. Drama necessarily is best conducted in heterogeneous groups so that each participant benefits from the variety of those that he is working with. The corollary of this, together with (6) above, is that we are in favour of mixed ability groupings of pupils for work in English and opposed to "streaming" or "tracking," though we emphasize also the need to work with smaller differentiated groups within the mixed ability class, depending upon the nature of the activity in progress.

8. We considered carefully the plight of the child who does not wish to take part in drama activity. However we feel that this problem will loom less large in the kind of teaching situation that we describe and where progress in drama work has been continuous since the start of school life. In the last resort we would however defend the child's right not to take part, though one expects that right would rarely be exercised.

The paper "Drama as Threat" (Douglas Barnes) shows that we have also considered some of the possible dangers that may arise in this work.

However we have to accept that all education is in this sense a dangerous business--even exposure to literature presumably affects a child's personality--and the threats in the case of drama are no greater than elsewhere in the English programme. Intense emotional involvement with a role is in any case less likely to arise in classroom drama where the situation is contrived deliberately so that each child will have the chance of adopting a number of different roles and where there is no audience to play to except himself and the group of which he is part.

9. We also faced the problem of the teacher who is inadequately prepared for this kind of work. We would urge upon training institutions the need to give teachers experience in drama work as part of their professional training, in practice rather than simply in theory; and we would see the English Department itself as an important instrument of training here. It is possible, for example, to combine classes together so that the "drama expert" on a department staff can work alongside his less expert colleagues and in this way can help their training while educating the children also. A particular value of drama lies in its flexibility which adapts it to both group and team teaching methods.

10. We are concerned about the lack of adequate facilities in many schools for this kind of work, and would urge the widespread conception of an English workshop--equipped with stackable furniture, sound-proof tape recording booths, space readily available for movement work, drama rostra, etc. The Seminar should go on record as demanding an adequate provision

of facilities of this kind to enable the English teacher to do his job. (There will be a further comment on this point in the report of Working Party 4.)

11. We need throughout the teaching of English to direct attention more and more to the experience, the reality, the fact, and away from the purely academic study of literature and language. It is because drama is a most effective means of doing this that we insist upon its centrality to the student and the teacher-in-training alike. Its elevation to its proper place in the curriculum could be the central fact in a total reappraisal of the work of the English programme in schools and colleges with, we believe, consequent improvement in standards at all levels of performance in all aspects of the programme.

Appendices The attached documents, originally prepared as discussion drafts for the study group, embody and develop this argument:

1) The theoretical basis of the central role of drama in the English curriculum--papers by Arthur Eastman and Ben de Mott.

2) Practical implications:

   a) In the primary school--paper compiled by James Moffett after discussions with primary school teachers.

   b) In the secondary school--an account of a syllabus and classroom procedures in a comprehensive secondary school compiled by Anthony Adams.

   c) "Drama as Threat"--Douglas Barnes.

3) We commend in addition to the Seminar's attention the original working paper for Study Group Number 2 by Douglas Barnes and

the essay "Drama: What Is Happening" by James Moffett, already circulated to Seminar members, and to some aspects of which a brief introduction is attached herewith.

Proposals for Action and Research

1) It is felt strongly that an opportunity should be provided for a visiting team of American teachers to tour English sc hools at the secondary level with a strong programme in drama work so that a transatlantic exchange of experience in this field can be effected.

2) There is a need for an investigation into the best kind of design for an English workshop on the lines described above and bringing pressure to bear upon school building programmes to ensure that these facilities are provided for the English teacher.

3) Research is needed on the relationship of work in drama to the production of composition work of all kinds by children, including the role that it can play in the development of impersonal writing, and the possible verification by experiment of the claims made for it in this report.

Study Group No. 2 - Drama in Education

Documents

We hope that everyone will be able to read with care the actual report of the Group. The remaining papers present supporting evidence and go into greater detail on a number of specific points, particularly classroom procedures.

1. Report of Study Group No. 2 - Drama in Education (Anthony Adams)
2. Drama (Arthur Eastman)
3. About Drama and Composition (Ben de Mott)
4. Drama in Primary School (James Moffett)
5. Drama Syllabus for the Secondary School (Anthony Adams)
6. Some Practical Considerations (Anthony Adams)
7. Drama as Threat (Douglas Barnes)
8. An Introduction to James Moffett's "Drama: What Is Happening" (Douglas Barnes & Arthur Eastman)
9. On Soliloquy (James Moffett)
10. From Dialogue to Other Forms of Discourse (James Moffett)

Drama

Drama is larger than literary--and earlier. It is mime and talk as well as script. It opens to the inarticulate and illiterate that engagement with experience on which literature rests. It permits them, and people in general, to discover their private human potentialities, to participate in and share the experience of the group, to make experience public.

Drama is primal. There is the actuality--people, voices, gesture, movement. Next, the physical presentation, the acting it out. And then, the literary imitation, the script. Drama is the matrix, the primal ocean in which the other literary forms float--monologue and dialogue, exposition, narration, description, argument, lyric, oration, epigram, apothegm. Drama is the source from which, by temporal or philosophical abstraction, other literary forms flow: from its present develops the past tense of story and history; from its conflict and dialogue develop argument and discourse.

Drama liberates. It releases its practitioner from the inhibitions of selfconsciousness. As it is play, make-believe rather than believe, it permits the individual to try on an attitude or model an emotion without paying actuality's price. It releases its practitioner, too, from the explicit interpretive restraints more common in other forms of literature. The actor may and must find within himself what it is to be jealous, envious, distraught, ambitious. Finally, as the practitioner becomes creator, writer, drama opens to him the discovery of something approaching the totality of himself. The many voices of his play and the many emotions, conflicting, harmonizing,

commenting--these are all his, spectroscopic fragmentations of a self which willy-nilly speaks in all he writes and which, discovered and released, can speak hereafter in his writing with new richness and vitality.

Drama adapts to varying sequences of literary education. Between the experience and the composition thereon, acting-out, along with discussion, drawing, and dancing, may help definition and interpretation. Before or after reading the lyric or story, acting-out may engage the pupil in the relevant experience. And the oral and physical re-creation of script in acting, with all the attendant explicit choices of tone, gesture, and attitude, prepares for the reading of literature generally, with the choices and now implicit: the outward prepares for the inward.

Drama in Primary School

In both the United Kingdom and the United States, dramatic activities seem to be an important part of primary education. The avowed goals are usually to:

1) develop language skills,

2) foster creative expression,

3) enlarge the vocal and experiential repertoire of the child, and

4) initiate engagement with literature.

The content of their dramas has two main sources--already existing stories drawn from fairy tales, myth, children's books, and television; and situations from first-hand experience. Bernice Christenson emphasized heavily the use of drama in social studies--basing improvisations, for example, on knowledge about policemen, firemen, etc.

Activities Movement-in-space exercises ("dance"), sometimes with music. Parallel, free play with all kinds of props.

Enactment of familiar stories in variety of ways--pantomime, with puppets and marionettes, through improvised dialogue and movement. A common procedure seems to be to discuss the characters and sequence of actions--what the people are like, which actions follow other actions--then to ask who wants to be so-and-so. Pupils might take turns playing the same roles and thus create variant enactments within the whole group. Or (a procedure of Connie Rosen) the class would break into four self-selected groups (8-10 each), talk about the story, then put on its allotted segment of the story before the other groups.

Improvisation of domestic or other familiar situations.

Most dramatizations seem to arise out of discussions of a certain material, whether a story, everyday events, or the "westward movement" in American history.

Props Primary teachers seem to agree that younger children often improvis more freely when they can "mask" their own identity and thus more easily assume another. A hat or bit of clothing, a mask or sceptre, often does the trick. Puppets and marionettes have the advantage of allowing the child to hide while speaking. A wide variety of props helps the child invent (furniture, kitchen utensils, store items, etc.). Telephones are sometimes used for dialogue.

Teacher's Role She may participate in or lead pre-drama discussions, sometimes shift pupils from one group to another, or even ask prompting questions during an improvisation (although many teachers would be against this). Some feel that the teacher should make an effort to engage withdrawn pupils but admit that such efforts should be very gentle and that in extreme cases the pupil should be allowed to watch until he is ready to act.

Sequences Individual--pair--group (great consensus here)

Movement-in-space--pantomime--verbal improvisation

Free play--selection of dialogue and action

Unpatterned spontaneity--planned performance for peers (Most primary teachers deplore performance for parents as irrelevant and disruptive. They are in no hurry to reach planned performance even for peers.)

Unscripted--scripted (Older children writing their own plays and organizing the whole procedure of rehearsal and performance--Connie mentioned 11-year olds. Borrowing plots of, say, miracle plays and putting them in their own terms and form.)

Sybil Marshall thought of trying to use remainder of class group as a kind of chorus, as transition between non-audience and audience--untested idea.

Connie remarked that speaking and moving at same time is often a problem for young children.

Drama Syllabus for the Secondary School

General: In teaching drama we are seeking to provide a means of growth in imaginative experience for our pupils which is both valid in its own right and which will also inform and transfer to their written work. It is a central activity in the English course and is as vital to the progress of "academic" sets as to the remainder. It is also important that training in drama is progressive throughout the course and does not tail off at the end of the second year. Normally about one period in a five-period week should be devoted to the drama section of the course. For those not used to this kind of work the following books will be found invaluable:

A.F. Alington: Drama and Education

Pemberton-Billing & Clegg: Teaching Drama

while there are some useful ideas and information in

Rose Bruford: Teaching Mime.

Aim: It cannot be too strongly stressed that this work has no direct connection with the work of theatricals in other respects. We are aiming at the development of the individual children in our classes, not the production of professional actors. On the other hand successful experience of drama in the first years of the course should lead to an increased ability to tackle the scripted play later and, in this way, link up with the literature work done in the remainder of the syllabus.

Principles and Methods

1. Audience: At the beginning of the course always, and in the later stages frequently, no audience will be required. In basic movement exercises for

example it is best to have the whole of the class working at the same time--the actor will generally provide his own audience in this work, and the stress should be upon doing things rather than on exhibiting them to others. At a later stage the discipline involved in the production of a polished presentation may have some value, but this aspect should never be over-stressed.

2. Staging: Drama work should generally be done "in the round," and free, wide-ranging movement encouraged. The stage is normally irrelevant to our purposes until late in the course, although the potentiality of different levels of staging through the use of drama rostra may be grasped early in the course. (The extensive use of dining halls for drama and movement work is strongly recommended and this may help to overcome the difficulties at present resulting from the inaccessibility of the halls for the greater part of the week.)

3. Improvisation: It is the core of the course. The scripted play, when used at all, will always be approached via improvisation rather than directly.

Note: We have in stock a series of textbooks such as Calling All Playmakers and Drama in the Making. These are valuable as a source of inspiration and ideas to the teacher, but they are not generally to be issued to sets. The ideas for drama should emerge from the children and the class situation, not from textbook sources.

4. Music: A great deal of valuable movement and drama work can emerge out of the stimulus provided by music, and a stock of records is being acquired for this purpose. An appendix to this section of the syllabus lists some of the material available and the uses to which it may be put.

5. Mime: As a formalized activity it is not to be encouraged, but as a basis for imaginative and movement work it is most useful. Practice in doing things through mime will transfer not only to an understanding of situations and the people involved in them but also to written work; it is particularly useful in connection with such things as the experimental composition scheme.

6. Group Work: Drama is essentially a group activity and the emergence of small groups as a basis for the work arising out of a great deal of individual work in the earliest stages is to be strongly encouraged.

7. Play Reading: This is a valuable activity, though quite distinct from drama proper. Strongly recommended is group play-reading (on the analogy of group-reading in primary school). This provides a widening imaginative and literary experience and, at the same time, practice in reading aloud, especially valuable for the less able children. It is hoped that several small sets of plays can be made available shortly for this.

8. Lesson Planning: In this aspect of English teaching, more perhaps than any other preparation, both the individual lesson and sequence of lessons are essential. The books cited above will prove useful to those beginning this work. Discipline from the start is essential and the class should become accustomed to a definite routine for beginning and ending each section of the lesson. The following lesson plan will be found helpful as the kind of thing to establish as a norm:

a) Class Work. Individual activities under the teacher's direction, often preparatory for work to be tackled under (c);

b) Pair or Group Work with each group tackling the same or related work;

c) Free Group Work or Whole Class Activity. Often an activity emerging out of the earlier group work begun under (b), relating the activity of one group to that of another;

d) Relaxation work to wind down and prepare the class for its next lesson.

9. Links with other work: Every effort should be made to establish close links between work in drama and that done elsewhere in the course. Thus dramatization, aided often by music, myths, and legends is a valuable part of the work in the first year, and such activity as movement through a desert may often usefully be followed by written work on related subjects. It is because drama is seen as an integral part of the whole English syllabus that the provision of a separate drama department, as distinct from the English department in the school, would not be regarded as a good thing.

Above all drama is essentially a practical subject and is learned through doing rather than through theorizing about it.

Particular Aspects of Individual Years. Note that the pace should not be pushed too hard. For example speech should emerge naturally out of movement and mime, and some of the less able pupils will not be able to manage the more theoretical sections of the syllabus. Even with the most able pupils the scripted play should always arise out of improvisation rather than the other way round.

In the following detailed syllabus "dramatization" differs from "improvisation" in that it implies a definite "shaping" of the material in a consciously dramatic form.

First Year

a) Improvisation (1): Based upon occupational activities, settings of everyday situations, objects, characters, and scenes. A great deal of this work will originate in mime and speech will enter rapidly as an extension of this.

b) Dramatization of Story: Material drawn from fable, folk-tale, mythology, literature, history, geography, etc. (This can progress throughout the year with dramatization developing from a story-a-week basis to polished improvisations extending over 3-4 weeks.)

c) Movement (1): Music, Movement, and Mime - A. Introductory Activities (i) without external rhythms; (ii) with external rhythms provided by percussion or music on records; (iii) free movement and mime echoing rhythm and mood of music. B. Movement to a simple story retailed by teacher, amplified by discussion and practice, and created as a complete unit with admixture of dialogue, music, narrative, movement, and mime.

Possible presentations:

1. Any polished version of (a) or (b).
2. Symposium of speech, drama, music, poetry, song - built around a seasonal festival (e.g., Harvest), and incorporating, where possible, the children's own writing.
3. A developed story from (c) - e.g., to L'Arlesienne, Night on a Bare Mountain, Hall of the Mountain King.

4. The Nativity - mime sequence and groupings with readings and carols - see: John Arden, The Business of Good Government, and possible improvisation and adaptions from medieval miracle plays.

Second Year

a) Improvisation (2): A. Aiming at scenario (mime) and dialogue (speech). "Polished improvisation" first, scripted later; B. Play making, i.e., deliberate reshaping of material (both story and ideas) to provide exposition, climax and conclusion, and dramatic compression. (For a good example of play-making see: John Arden, Death of a Cowboy.)

b) Movement (2): (i) Exploration of space, time, weight, direction and qualities of movement by imaginative exercises and the use of percussion and music; (ii) Mood in music and expression of mood in mime and free dance; (iii) Development of ritual dance and story with dance situations.

c) The Script Play (1): Approached by narrative and improvisation of characters, situations, and scenes.

Possible presentations:

1. Any of (a), (b), or (c).
2. The Nativity or Passion story (or mythical material) - still with music and mime but also with patches of improvised or scripted dialogue, where appropriate.

Third Year

a) The Script Play (2): Text either (i) approached by improvisation or (ii) amplified and clarified by improvisation (see also (d) below).

b) Movement (3): (i) Dance drama - primitive ballet created with or without story to music or percussion; (ii) "Historic" movement - with (c) below. (For this see Rose Bruford op. cit.)

c) History of the Theatre (1): By pictures of theatre and staging of short extracts (it is hoped to make some film strips and wall charts available for this purpose.) (i) Medieval: script plays from Lynette Feasey, Old England at Play and similar volumes. (ii) Commedia del' Arte: mime plays with more complicated plot and conventional characters (see Holbrook, Thieves and Angels). (iii) Elizabethan: first approach to Shakespeare via short extracts (see The Drama Highway for examples.)

d) Improvisation (3): Simple "Social Drama" - conventional situations first - interviews, votes of thanks, public speeches - obvious links here with oral work and crowd sequences in drama.

e) The Theatre at Work (1): Staging the play - scenery, lighting.

Fourth Year

a) The Script Play (3): Play study, with acting but with or without production.

b) Movement (4): (i) "Dance drama" (optional work at this stage - child created); (ii) Historic movement - with (c) below.

c) History of the Theatre (2): As before with examples for (i) 18th century; (ii) Melodrama; (iii) Modern theatre, particularly new forms of staging - N.B. Theatre in the Round at Stoke; (iv) Greek.

d) The Theatre at Work (2): Make-up, costume, settings, organization. A theatre visit after a preliminary study of the play and discussion afterwards, linked with an organized tour of the theatre is an invaluable part of this aspect of the course.

e) Play Production: A term's work as a project - open-air, summer term? (in any case an optional activity).

f) Improvisation (4): (i) used for clarification in Play Study, Production and extracts for History of the Theatre sections: (ii) Social Drama - A. Continuation of conventional situations; B. Playing out of adolescent and adult situations in speech and drama.

Note on Shakespeare: Little has been said directly about Shakespeare in the syllabus because it is felt strongly that he is part of a subject, rather than a subject in himself, and should be introduced naturally as part of the drama course. It should be realized however that there is a strongly built-in resistance to Shakespeare on the part of many of our children and if this is to be overcome the introduction of Shakespeare must be very gradual and tactful. The use of extract material will find a natural place in the Third Year syllabus above and, generally speaking, there should be no attempt to introduce a complete play until the Fourth Year, and even then judicious cutting is advisable. Ideally the first introduction to a complete play should come through the enjoyment of a theatrical performance. Probably Macbeth

and an adapted version of Julius Caesar are the best with which to start. It should be remembered that top sets in the Fifth Year will at present have to study a Shakespeare play as part of the O Level course and they should have had the experience of reading at least one full length play before this. Since so much of both good and harm for the future can be achieved in the initial stages here, members of the Department are asked to consult with the Head of Department before introducing a complete Shakespeare play for the first time with their sets.

A comprehensive collection of recordings of the plays of Shakespeare is available.

Drama: What Is Happening

James Moffett

Research Associate in English

Harvard Graduate School of Education

A preliminary version of a chapter on teaching discourse by dramatic methods, to be part of a book on a unified theory of first-language instruction.

Drama is what is happening, unreported action. Narrative, by contrast, is what happened, reported action. That is, what we witness in the street comes to us unmediated by any other mind, unabstracted except by our own perceptual apparatus. What we witness on the stage has exactly the same impact, and the author works in the dramatic medium partly because he wants the events he has invented to hit us at the same 'gut' level that real-life drama does. The definition of drama I am going to use here will encompass both the theatrical and everyday meanings of the word and also the viewpoints of observer and participant.

Considered from the observer's vantage point, as information, drama represents the first order of encoding, the threshold between sensations and words. The script of a play is actually a transcription of what the spectator should see and hear. He is a kind of sound camera who records the play, but because he is human he records it in a discursive way. If his recording were written down it would recapitulate the script (except for Shavian extravagances). This same spectator could go out of the theater into the street, note down his sensations as he witnessed some action, and thereby create a script of his own.

The action does not have to be vocal or human to be dramatic; it might be a dumbshow or a game among dogs. For an observer, drama is any raw phenomena as it is first being converted to information.

Let us consider now one kind of action an observer might witness--vocal behavior. That is, let's take the standpoint of a speaker and consider drama as communication. Real-life conversation, or dialogue in a play, is primary discourse--spontaneous, ongoing, unpondered and uncomposed, like the observer's recording. In a word, both are extemporized. Dialogue is generated of the moment and moves in time, governed by setting and circumstances as well as by the wills of the speakers. Neither knows what he is going to say a minute hence because that depends on what his interlocutor says in the meantime and perhaps also on what is going on around them. Face to face, each relies on non-verbal cues from voice, face, and body as well as on the lexical meanings of the words. Feedback is fast, clearing up, or aggravating, misunderstanding. I call this 'primary' because (1) it is the first discourse we learn: (2) it is the least abstract in the sense of least planned and ordered (however abstract individual words and statements may be): and (3) it is discourse in its most physical and behavioral form. That is, face-to-face dialogue is most localized in time and space. It blends with and is dependent on other physical action, both of the body and of surroundings. It relies on the interlocutors' seeing and hearing each other, and on ostensive communication (pointing). It is often interchangeable with other action: a kiss or blow can replace words and vice versa. Organizatior by one mind is minimal, for interaction partly determines the selection and arrangement of words, ideas, and images. Continuity, topic - and even word choice and sentence structures - are governed

in large measure by the social interchange and the surroundings and circumstances.

Drama is the most accessible form of literature for young and uneducated people. It is made up of discourse that we all practice all the time. A kindergarten child or an older illiterate can soliloquize and converse, verbalize to himself and vocalize to others. No written symbols are required. Drama is primitive: not only does it hit us at the level of sensation, affect, and conditioned response, it seems in all cultures to be virtually the first, if not the first, verbal art to come into being, because it is oral and physical and evolves directly out of functional, real-life activities.

A play of course only pretends to be raw, unabstracted phenomena: actually it is a highly sophisticated conceptual creation. Characters, settings, words, and deeds are carefully selected and patterned. In fact, one essential difference between the theater and the street is this difference between order and randomness--which is one measure of abstraction. So in this sense a play is very abstract. Characters tend to be representative, the actions symbolic, the words and deeds significant. By selecting and shaping, the artist abstracts reality into forms that mean something to the audience. The impact of a play is dependent on some resonance between what is happening on stage and what has happened in the life of the spectator. No matter how far he is from being a king or from killing someone, the beholder of a revenge tragedy finds, for the feelings of betrayal and the murderous desire for quittance, some analogs in himself. The playwright makes generalization easy but does not generalize himself because he does not speak. In presenting what is happening he is implicitly saying what happens. This transferability is what we mean when we

speak of the significance of a work.

Nevertheless, a play is not a novel, poem, biography, or essay. Despite its selectivity, conceptualization, and implicit generality, it is an imitation of physical action and therefore still shows characteristics of the informational and communicational mode it imitates: it is calculated to affect a spectator in much the same way a real-life drama does when he is confronted with it. And you don't have to know how to read to follow a play. You can't backtrack because words and deeds move irreversibly in time. Reflection is held to a minimum, to "thinking on your feet." No guiding voice conducts you, plays host, summarizes and explains. (To offset this lack of interpreter, some playwrights may create a character who serves as a narrator or as a raisonneur, but note that to the extent such a character remains a character, and the play a drama, the result is merely to create a new level of unabstracted information.) Regardless of how cerebral a statement some character may utter, it is the behavioral utterance of the statement and not its content that makes a play dramatic. If the author wanted his audience to reflect more, he would write in another form.

The speech components of a play are soliloquy, dialogue, and monologue. The nature of each of these, and the relations among them, imply some very important things, I believe, for the teaching of discourse. I will examine them as phenomena of both the theater and real life.

Though theatrical convention and necessity require that it be voiced, a soliloquy is supposed to be unuttered thoughts, self-verbaliztion. Soliloquizing is thinking. At least as early as Henri Bergson and William James, psychologists have suggested that thought is inner speech. The notion has

been subscribed to since by the social psychologist George Herbert Mead and by an impressive roster of contemporary specialists in learning theory and child development that includes Piaget, Vygotsky, Luria, and Bruner. The general concept is that most of our thinking, the verbal part, is a kind of unvoiced conversation within oneself. After acquiring speech socially, through interaction with other people, the child begins to distinguish between the speech he utters for himself and the speech he utters for others. At first he voices aloud all speech, typically failing, in his egocentricity, to discriminate talking to himself and talking to another. Once he does discriminate, this early "egocentric speech" splits into internal and external discourse. Both are instrumental but have different functions: internal speech serves to process information as a guide to action; external speech serves to communicate. The earlier egocentric speech is a "thinking out loud," a running accompaniment to play and thus probably not distinguished by the child from his other bodily actions. Part of this patter is simply a verbal encoding of physical things, and part is planning and self-direction--all of which he later inhibits because it is not socially adaptive, and may even be socially detrimental if uttered aloud. In shunting some of his own speech underground, the child is in effect internalizing the words, forms, and ideas of other people, since he learned them by imitation and interaction. Anyone can observe for himself some of the stages of this internalization. A child will tell himself aloud--in perhaps his parents' exact words--that "we should not touch the vase." Children thinking about a task can be seen to move their lips, so that an experienced lipreader can tell what they are thinking as they verbally meditate the task.

It is not generally acknowledged just how much the social medium of exchange and the chief instrument of thought are one and the same--language. Outer and inner speech reciprocally determine each other; they are a serpent with its tail in its mouth. What needs emphasis, however, is thought as the internalization of social processes. For this emphasis I turn to George Herbert Mead.

> In reflective intelligence one thinks to act, and to act solely so that this action remains a part of a social process. Thinking becomes preparatory to social action. The very process of thinking is, of course, simply an inner conversation that goes on, but it is a conversation of gestures which in its completion implies the expression of that which one thinks to an audience. One separates the significance of what he is saying to others from the actual speech and gets it ready before saying it. He thinks it out and perhaps writes it in the form of a book; but it is still a part of social intercourse in which one is addressing other persons and at the same time addressing one's self, and in which one controls the address to other persons by the response made to one's own gesture. That the person should be responding to himself is necessary to the self, and it is this sort of social conduct which provides behavior within which that self appears. I know of no other form of behavior than the linguistic in which the individual is an object to himself, and, so far as I can see, the individual is not a self in the reflective sense unless he is an object to himself. It is this fact that gives a critical importance to communication, since this is a type of behavior in which the individual does so respond to himself.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The unity and structure of the complete self reflects the unity and structure of the social process as a whole; and each of the elementary selves of which it is composed reflects the unity and structure of one of the various aspects of that process in which the individual is implicated. In other words, the various elementary selves which constitute, or are organized into, a complete self are the various aspects of the structure of that complete self answering to the various aspects of the structure of the social process as a whole; the structure of the complete self is thus a reflection of the complete social process. The organization and unification of a social group is identical with the organization and unification of any one of the selves arising within the social process in which that group is engaged or which it is carrying on.

> The phenomenon of dissociation of personality is caused by a breaking up of the complete, unitary self into the component selves of which it is composed, and which respectively correspond to different aspects of the social process in which the person is involved, and within which his complete or unitary self has arisen; these aspects being the different social groups to which he belongs within that process.*

If I understand Mead correctly, self and mind are social artifacts, and the constituents of the self are the constituents of society; thought involves incorporating the roles and attitudes of others and addressing oneself internally as one would another.

As inner conflict becomes more important in the plays of Shakespeare, the soliloquies become longer and more numerous. Compare those of Brutus and Hamlet. Reflected in Hamlet's soliloquies are various 'voices' of his culture, society, class, and family--belief systems, attitudes, points of view, and roles. These could be personified and each assigned certain lines from his soliloquies, thus creating an external dialogue to prove Mead's point. Hamlet is full of voices, ghosts. So is Willy Loman. And so are we all. Consider what it means when we say "I keep telling myself. . .," "I debated with myself. . .," "I talked myself into. . .," and so on. Biologically each of us is a whole: only cognitively and culturally can we be split into speaker and listener.

---

*George Herbert Mead. "Self" in On Social Psychology: Selected Papers, ed. Anselm Strauss. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1964. pp. 206, 208.

To consider the same issue in reversal, the whole of a play may be considered as a soliloquy by the playwright, who is ventriloquizing. A playwright says what he has to say not through a monologue but through a colloquy of created voices. The ensemble of these voices externalizes his mind. This kind of ventriloquizing amounts to fractionating the total voice production of which he is capable, to breaking down his self into the many points of view, attitudes, and roles which actually and potentially comprise it. The failure of young readers to appreciate Dickens' caricatures, and the failure of critics to 'understand' Waiting for Godot, stems from an insistence that each character be a whole person instead of recognizing that it is the dramatis personae which is a whole person and that the characters are embodied tendencies and potentialities of that person. Becket's Gogo and Didi, Pozzo and Lucky, are components of personality, paired. If a play works, communicates, it is because the same social forces that have installed voices in the author have also installed them in the spectator. Whether the playwright is sociological like Shaw, psychological like Strindberg, or both like Arthur Miller, the characters tend to speak as both personality components and as social forces. In After the Fall Miller finally completed a technical innovation begun by O'Neil in Emperor Jones, Tennessee Williams in The Glass Menagerie, and himself in Death of a Salesman: by exploiting the incorporation process for the very form of his play, he made the stage a peopled head.

To place the discourse of the individual in a perspective that helps us to contemplate it most usefully, let us imagine a set of concentric circles that has the individual as center. Each circle is a context for the smaller circles

it contains, and therefore governs them. The largest or most universal circle is the biological context--the structure of our nervous system. If something innate explains language acquisition, as linguists of Noam Chomsky's persuasion believe, it is governed by this context. My own persuasion is that the predispositions for the uniquely human kinds of abstraction are indeed innate, but not as 'ideas,' as Chomsky would have it. 'Language universals,' structures found in all languages, are probably reflections of neural structures as claimed by Warren McCulloch, for example. The next largest circle is the culture, which determines the thought of the individual through belief systems and postulates about nature built into its languages and supporting institutions. Within this context lie the cognitive differences among, say, Indo-European, Chinese, Eskimo, and Hopi cultures such as Benjamin Lee Whorf talked about. Whorf's hypothesis that the categories and grammar of a particular culture shape the thought of the individual is bound to be relatively true. What is an open issue is the proportionate influence on the individual of language universals on the one hand and cultural idiosyncracies on the other--the relative weight of the innate and the acquired. But this issue is complicated tremendously by the influence of the successively smaller contexts--the national and ethnic society, social sub-groups, and the family. More and more, researchers such as Basil Bernstein are claiming connections between 'cognitive styles' and social class; others are finding connections among cognitive styles, language styles, and life styles. A mother's way of talking to her child influences the child's cast of thought, but the mother's way of talking is in turn governed by her class and ethnic heritage. If schools wish to teach students how to think and speak, they must take account of the language contexts surrounding

the individual. The head of any soliloquizer is peopled.

Although we customarily regard thought as private and internal, it is in many respects really very impersonal and external. Original permutations of thought may be very individualistic, but the tool of thought is a socially forged instrument. The abstractive structures we are born with are open and flexible and may, as research in anthology and cognitive styles shows, produce very different abstractions in different groups. It is from his groups that the individual learns these particular ways of cognizing and verbalizing. In view of this, a pedagogy based on provoking or eliciting thought presupposes that a child is already capable of generating the required kinds of thoughts. Asking 'stimulating' questions and assigning 'stimulating' reading invites the student to put out but does not give him anything, as teachers of the disadvantaged know well. In order to generate thoughts a student must have previously internalized some discursive operations that he can use as tools. Elicitation has a place certainly at some stage of instruction, but more basic is to create the kinds of social discourse that when internalized become the kinds of cognitive instruments called for by later tasks. The failure of disadvantaged students to think and talk White Anglo-Saxon Protestant Middle Class prose stems obviously from their not having been talked to and with in the way White Anglo-Saxon Protestant Middle Class people talk to and with their children. But even the most advantaged child will never escape the cognitive limitations of family, class, social role, etc. unless the school provides him a kind of discursive experience to internalize that is different from what he internalized at home. The cranium is the globe, but the globe any child grows up in is always too

small for later purposes, especially in civilization as we know it and are increasingly going to know it.

Among the considerations that impell me to agree essentially with Mead, even though he seems to slight innate factors, is that his theory jibes with other important theories. When Erik Ericson relates kinds of societies to kinds of ego structures, he too is assuming that an individual is a walking model of his social world. Freud's concept of super ego--the voice of conscience--is based on the notion of introjecting outside attitudes. And cognitive growth, according to Piaget, depends on expanding perspective by incorporating foreign points of view. This 'decentering' is the principal corrective to egocentrism (and ethnocentrism, geocentrism, etc.).

All this is to say that soliloquy is more than a stage device. Self-verbalizing or interior monologue is really interior dialogue. All the wickedly intricate relations of thought and speech, mind and society are involved in it. The observer of a drama recording what he sees and hears is engaged in low-level thinking, in a kind of soliloquy. The difference is that Hamlet is reflecting at a high level of abstraction whereas the spectator is momentarily anchored to his perceptions. Nothing but the author's purpose prevents Hamlet from verbalizing his sensations (as Macbeth sometimes does), and nothing but the spectator's absorption in the action prevents his rising to generalities. In short, while Hamlet is soliloquizing, so is the audience.

So in two ways drama is the matrix of discourse and the starting point for learning it. As information, it is the inner speech of the observer at the moment of coding raw phenomena. The corresponding educational activity is recording. As communication, it is the social speech of the participant at the

moment of vocalizing face to face. The corresponding educational activity is oral improvisation. Soliloquy is intrapersonal dialogue, which is verbal thought. Conversation is interpersonal dialogue, which is vocal speech. These two activities feed each other: when we communicate we internalize conversation that will influence how. . . .

Let us say, as evidence indicates, that children tend to differentiate and qualify more the older they grow: that in the beginning they lump things and actions together that for purposes of both information and communication would be better if verbalized more discriminately. The problem is cognitive in a general way, involving perception and affect as well as concepts. But research has established that finer discrimination of either the symbol or the referent leads to greater discrimination of the other. More accurate speech refines observation, and more accurate observation refines speech. Children whose parents qualify when talking will tend to qualify when thinking. Linguistically, qualification and discrimination are matters not just of finding more precise nouns but of adding adjectives to nouns, inserting relative clauses, employing adverbs and prepositions of time, place, and manner, and connecting sentence elements with interpretive words such as however, although, if, despite, and instead of. It is important to note that using prepositional phrases, relative clauses, and conjunctions necessarily entails transforming and embedding sentences. A crucial relation exists between qualifying thought and elaborating sentence structures. In fact the only reason for encouraging a student to generate complexities from kernels, aside from stylistic variety and its consequent rhetorical effect, is to enable him to qualify his information and communication. Kernel sentences assert unqualified statements. Without access

to transformations, thought is likely to remain crude, and speech will follow suit. Again, discourse does not just convey thought, it is also a forger of thought. Even if one chooses nouns and verbs with exquisite precision it is very difficult to symbolize reality with any justice in kernel sentences only. But a teacher listening to a student speak, or reading his theme, may never know whether he produces baby sentences because his perceptions and conceptions are crude or because he can't transform sentences. The best policy in any case is to enlarge the student's repertory of sentence structures.

My proposal for teaching linguistic forms will go against the current trend to adapt modern grammars directly to the classroom by devising exercises that resemble the linguist's own analyses. A student in such a program, for example, is asked to read a simplified theory of transformational grammar, then to diagram sample sentences, to think up samples of his own that are structurally like a model, and to take kernel sentences and transform them into one elaborate sentence. I think this is misguided. The transfer of these exercises to the skills of speaking and writing is as dubious as with the old grammar exercises. Furthermore, isolated sentences lack the realistic context out of which choices of linguistic forms or sentence structures are made--that is, the context of the whole, motivated discourse. When a student needs to learn a transformation is right when he is discoursing himself. Finally, by school age children know most of the transformations the exercises are about; why they do not use them is apparently another issue, an issue that exercises do not deal with.

I think the classroom method for helping students learn to qualify thought and elaborate sentence structures should be essentially the same method by which children spontaneously learn to do these things out of school. Although direct

imitation is part of the method, it is probably not the main part or the most effective; very young children will join two clauses with because because they have heard such sentences but may fail to establish any true causal connection. I would like to submit that the most important and successful way we learn to qualify and transform is by internalizing the whole give and take of conversations. That is, the learner synthesizes what both A and B said, especially when he himself is one of the interlocutors, and produces in the future a new sentence that is a transformation of the two original utterances and therefore a more elaborate statement than was either before. This is a very different process than the learner's hearing an utterance of a certain construction one time and then at another time, in what he perceives to be a similar situation, constructing a similar sentence. This is imitation and is undoubtedly of value in acquiring language and shaping thought, but, as in the causal construction, the learner is often wrong. Imitating one utterance, furthermore, is not as potent a method as synthesizing two utterances.

One of the unique qualities of dialogue is that the interlocutors build on each other's sentence constructions. A conversation is verbal collaboration. Each party borrows words and phrases and structures from the other, recombines these, elaborates them, or adds to them. An exchange may consist of several kinds of operations, or rather, co-operations. One such operation may be question-and-answer. A makes a statement and B asks for more information. The answer to B's question may be either a direct transformation of his question or a sentence which if added to A's original statement would result in a transformation of it. At the same time, the original statement is being qualified by the addition of the further information. Thus:

A: I saw that dog again. B: Where? A: Down along the river. (locative phrase)	I saw that dog again down along the river.
A: I saw that dog again. B. Which one? A: That shaggy one we found in the barn yesterday. (adjective) (relative clause)	I saw that shaggy dog again that we found in the barn yesterday.
A: The bill will never pass. B: Why not? A: It's too close to elections. (independent clause)	The bill will never pass because it's too close to elections.
A: The bill will never pass. B: Never? A: Well, I mean it can't until after elections. (temporal phrase)	The bill can't pass until after elections.

Another operation consists of simply appending a qualifying clause to the original statement:

A: He'll make it, don't worry. B: If he finds the key in time. (conditional clause)	He'll make it if he finds the key in time.
A: These angles will always be equal, then. B: So long as these lines are parallel. (correlative clause)	These angles will always be equal so long as these lines are parallel.

A quantifier may be amended:

A: All the other members are opposed to an early cancellation. B: Some are anyway.	Some of the other members are opposed to early cancellation.

Perhaps the most important operation occurs when B adds to A's statement another fact, point of view, or argument that (he implies) A should allow for. The conjunctive relation between the two statements is only implied but would be supplied by A in a future discourse:

A: Government ownership of railroads would not work in the U.S. B: It has worked in England and France.	Although government ownership of railroads has worked in England and France, it would not work in the U.S. (concessive conjunction) or The fact that government ownership of railroads has worked in England and France does not mean it will work in the U.S. (nominal clause)
A: Miss Leary scowls all the time and makes you stand outside the door. B: I've heard that she gives the lowest grades in the whole school.	Miss Leary scowls all the time, makes you stand outside the door, and gives the lowest grades in the whole school. or Miss Leary not only scowls all the time and makes you stand outside the door, she also gives the lowest grades in school. (additive constructions)
A: You can make it in twenty minutes from here. B: What if the drawbridge is up?	You can make it in twenty minutes from here unless the drawbridge is up. (proviso clause)

These examples are crude compared to the dynamics of continuous dialogue, where this process of appending and amending may continue across many utterances, and sometimes with A further elaborating B's contributions. The sharpening of thought, the elaboration of sentence structures, and the increased use of functor words such as prepositions, conjunctions, and interpretive adverbs--all develop together. Outside the classroom this development through vocal exchange occurs all the time, but in the classroom it can be furthered deliberately by creating kinds of dialogue in which questioning, qualifying, and collaborating are habitual give-and-take-operations. Adjustive feedback by no

means requires an adult always, but an adult may be necessary to help establish the necessary characteristics of the conversation. If interlocutors do not really engage with each other, pick up cues, and respond directly, or if they merely listen out the other and wait for their turn to speak, nothing very educational will happen.

I am asking the reader to associate dialectic with dialogue. The internal conversation we call thinking recapitulates previous utterances as amended and expatiated on. The social actions underlying vocal exchange have counterparts in the forms of language--in the functor words and their entailed constructions. Additives represent agreement; adversatives, contradiction; concessives, provisos, and conditionals, a degree of acceptance and a degree of resistance. Constructions of time, place, manner, are born of when, where, and how questions motivated by the listener's desire to get more information from his speaker. Because is born of why; so of so what. The creation of relative clauses and the insertion of 'signal words' like however, moreover, and therefore stems from a felt need to relate statements for the benefit of the listener. The way the speaker becomes aware of this need is through questions of clarification or other feedback indicating the listener does not understand the relations among items or statements in the utterance. Although a child might come to use some functors and subordinate clauses just by sheer imprinting--stylistic imitation--I think it is safe to say that such learning would never go far or deep without the functional need for qualification and transformation arising in dialogue. This is why I do not think exercises with isolated sentences, no matter how superior the grammar, will teach students how to use various linguistic constructions appropriately and habitually. The expatiation process of

dialogue adjusts speaker's verbal and cognitive instruments at just the moment when he cares most and in just the way that he, individually, needs the adjustment.

. . .(?) crest, the high point of fast verbal interaction when interlocutors shoot single sentences or half sentences at each other in rapid alternation. Notoriously, monologue risks breaking a play, because the longer one speaker holds forth, the more the content of his speech overshadows his interaction with other players. Most television scenarists make it a point of never letting a character utter more than two or three sentences at a time. Whatever prompts a monologuist to talk so long carries with it some continuity or organizing principle that is likely to take the audience out of the present. If the monologue is a report of what happened, it goes into the past; if a generality about what happens, it goes into a timeless realm. Besides chronological and logical continuities, a third possibility exists--a sequence ordered by some psychologic--but such a monologue approaches soliloquy again and, indeed, is usually played by the actor with a certain self-absorption as a kind of musing. In all cases, monologue tends to carry us away from the existential circumstances of its utterance and to lessen interaction with a listener, but the psychological sequence remains more dramatic than the chronological or logical because, like a soliloquy, it has the present dynamic of moment-to-moment inner movement. The great success of Jerry's monologues in The Zoo Story is due to the fact that his stories and generalizations are themselves strongly enchained by a psychologic stemming from his intention to break Peter open and reach him, to find out if continuing to live is worth it.

Monologue is the bridge from drama to other forms of discourse. It is the beginning of a speech less moored to circumstance and audience, that floats more freely in time and space. It moves closer to organization and composition. It is the pathway to writing. And yet, ultimately, every monologue has some dialogue for its context, from which it issues. This is true whether the monologue is an anecdote in a backporch gossip session, the Greek messenger's report of Hippolytus' death, or a novel. Lest the third example seem out of order, let me suggest that any written composition may be usefully deemed a monologue, since it is uttered entirely by one person, and that the dialogue from which it issues is simply more extended over time and space. The solo work we call a novel is part of a slow-moving, long-range dialogue-at-a-distance between the novelist and his society. Feedback comes in the form of public response, sales, reviews, and critical articles. Among monologues, then, the critical distinction is between the face-to-face vocalizations, which are extemporaneous and very sensitive to audience presence and to circumstances of utterance, and written monologues, which are planned and composed in relative detachment from audience and circumstances. Further, among written monologues themselves there are degrees of composedness and detachment: consider a scale going from kinds of private, occasional writing such as letters, memos, and diaries to duplicated and published writing directed at an increasingly widespread audience.

If the teacher imagines a continuum going from the one extreme of stychomythia to the other extreme of the polished solo publication, he has then an instrument of great pedagogical value. For the gradations of the continuum are steps in a natural evolution from dialogue to written composition. A

curriculum sequence can be based on these gradations that will lead the student from conversation to vocal monologue to casual writing to formal writing. Many significant variables are at play in such a sequence. Improvisation becomes composition gradually--by extending over time and space the circumstances of the discoursing act, by making the audience larger and more remote, and by slowing down the feedback. As we move along this path the gap widens between thought and utterance, for our vocal speech more nearly resembles our spontaneous thought than our writing does. But the first step toward writing is made when a speaker takes over a conversation and sustains some subject alone. He has started to create a solo discourse that while intended to communicate to others is less collaborative, less prompted, and less corrected by feedback than dialogue. He bears more of the responsibility for effective communication. He has moved away from drama toward narrative, exposition, and theory--the domains of writing. He has started to enchain his utterances according to some logic. The cues for his next line are not what his interlocutor said but what he himself just said. Like a jazz solo, a monologue grows by self-stimulation. When such social behavior as question-and-answer, parry-thrust, statement-and-emendation no longer structure the discourse, some internal behavior, some logic, takes over and determines the order and arrangement of utterances. Even such one-way action as admonition, exhortation, and command cannot be sustained unless some logic is resorted to and some 'argument' set in motion. To abandon transaction in favor of transmission is to drop interrogative and imperative modes and to work solely in the declarative. The more independent the monologue, the more it is statement. What enchains the consecutive declarations of the monologuist is some order ranging from "then...then" to "if...then."

But logics do not, by any means, govern sequences alone. The speaker's rhetorical ploys determine order as much as any logic. In fact, the structure of a monologue is some fusion of the two. But I postpone my remarks on monological sequences until later chapters. For now my point is just that the possible continuities for vocal monologues are the same as for written compositions, including whole books. What varies in passing from vocalization to casual writing to formal writing are the psychologics and rhetorical ploys, which are dependent on the degree of localization in time and space. A backporch anecdote, a newsletter, and a novel are all monological but differ in the dialogical context out of which they arise.

To ask a student to write is to ask him to make all the adjustments between dialogue and monologue that I have been describing. I am saying that a curriculum should afford the student a rich experience in not only the right kinds of conversation but also in the variety of vocal and written monologues that bridge into full-fledged public composition. The most critical adjustment one makes is to relinquish collaborative discourse, with its reciprocal prompting and cognitive co-operation, and to go it alone. The first going it alone can be simply an extended utterance within a conversation. A very important issue of psychological independence is involved. This is a major reason why so many students--even adolescents--who can converse for hours claim they have "nothing to say" when asked to write. Forsaking the interrogative and imperative modes for declaration eliminates a lot of discourse that a child is most familiar with. Add to this the well known fact that an enormous amount of conversation is social communion, establishing and maintaining solidarity, and has little to do with developing a subject, which in fact is sometimes a pretty indifferent

matter. Add further that having to develop a real subject, alone, means employing one or more of the monological orders of statement. Where does the student find such things? Only in himself of course. And how do they get there? They get there through internalization of previous dialogues. . . .

When anyone verbalizes solo fashion, whether silently to himself (interior monologue), or aloud to another (dramatic monologue), or on paper to the world (published monologue), he must draw on discourse he has heard, had, and read. A student can give to the world only some permutations of what he got from the world.

Let me turn now to the actual teaching methods that these considerations of drama suggest to me. The appropriate classroom activities may be roughly divided into active discoursing by the student--conversing and writing--and the receptive occupations such as listening, reading, and beholding. But it is in the nature of dramatic methods that this division should not hold well, for what is output for one student is often input for another. In fact, all of these activities would be woven in and out of each other except during the pre-reading stage, when conversing would be the sole teaching method.

Because it is primary, I will begin with face-to-face vocalization, which breaks down into five activities--class workshop discussion, dramatic improvisation, play performing, panel discussion, and monologuing. These are closely related and each can operate upon the others.

The most fundamental activity, which should be a staple from kindergarten <u>through</u> college, is the class workshop discussion. It has value in itself as a process to be learned and it is also an instrument for learning about other

things, including the other four activities. It is a major source of that discourse which the student will transform internally into thought. To do these things, and others I will mention later, it must become a highly wrought tool considerably different from what generally passes in schools today for 'class discussion.'

To characterize the kind of group operation I have in mind, I need to compare it to two rather well known models. One is the kind of workshop long employed for apprentice actors, dancers, and craftsmen. The master sets the tasks (initially anyway), the apprentices present their productions to the group, and they all explore together the issues entailed by the tasks. The content is the students' productions and some brought in from the outside. The teacher's role is the natural one he has by virtue of being more experienced in the craft: he talks freely like any other member but does not feel obliged to pre-schedule what is to be talked about (his tasks may do this in a general way) or to center discussion around himself by catechising, calling on students, and talking serially with one after another. He fosters cross-education among the students, and they focus on the tasks, not the teacher. Each learns both from garnering reactions to his own work and from reacting in turn to the work of others. All become highly involved in what the others are doing, not only because they are engaged in the same tasks but, more importantly, because they are a social unit that is allowed to be precisely that.

The other model is the 'awareness group,' one offshoot of the manifold thing called group dynamics. Whereas group therapy may relase psychic forces that only a psychiatrist should be expected to manage, other kinds of dynamics have been successfully used in many practical groups, such as management train-

ing, to induce awareness in individuals of what roles they automatically take in a group, how others are reacting to them, how they are attempting to handle certain social relations, and what motives lie behind their own responses to others' behavior. In other words, instead of ignoring the underlying drama of what is happening among the communicants and steamrolling ahead to get on with the 'business,' the 'business' is construed as including both the objective task and the drama engendered in working on that task. The investments that corporations, institutions, and the armed services have made in such training attests to its practicality. Of course, it is up to experimentation to establish the kind and degree of insight appropriate for different ages, but some steady source of insight is indispensible. Miscommunication, poor collaboration, and distortion of the task will occur if the human relations are ignored or dealt with summarily as though they were a mere nuisance.

Furthermore, the awareness group is practical for language teaching in another way: a class is, like any constituted group, a miniature communication system; if the members pay attention to its workings they can learn more about what makes and breaks communication than any book on the subject can possibly get across. The connection with the theater is closer than one might suspect. A playwright presents a model of our behavior--especially verbal behavior--so contrived as to reveal what is <u>really</u> happening, to give insights about motive, relationship, and interaction. What makes these insights so difficult to achieve in the heat of real life is our inability to act and see simultaneously. Witnessing a play, we have an opportunity to <u>see</u>. But if the ground rules of a group permit halting the action to review it a moment, and deflecting attention from content to people, then individuals can overcome participation-blindness

and attain some of the insights afforded in the theater. A duality defines such a group, then--between involvement and detachment, between the communication and the meta-communication, the exposition and the drama.

An awareness workshop functions something like this. The class, let's say, has done a common writing assignment. One of the students' papers might be read aloud or projected overhead. Anyone may begin discussion about the paper. The teacher has no prepared questions but may well have definite ideas about what issues the particular assignment will entail. If these issues are real and worthwhile, students will raise them in their own terms, the terms that are meaningful to them. The teacher should be able to play the discussion by ear, to get students to pursue each other's spontaneous remarks.

For the sake of a rich multiplicity of ideas, dialects, points of view, vocabulary, etc., classes should be heterogeneously sectioned from a diverse student population and the teacher should promote honest student-to-student conversation. The teacher's main job is to help them learn how to play directly to each other, to question for information and clarification, and to expatiate on the others' statements. The raising of hands should be abolished but a ground rule of not interrupting held to. If each student has to get clearance from the teacher to speak, interaction among students has little chance to take place. Small children will perhaps want to talk at once, and the beginning might be difficult, but if we are to convert 'collective monologues'--simultaneous egocentric speeches--into real dialogue, the pupils must learn to listen and to respond to external as well as internal stimuli. Most of the furious flagging of hands and clamorous talking at once in traditional classes is actually provoked by the teacher, who usually has asked a question to which he knows the

answer. The children are competitively bidding for the teacher's approval and place no value on what other children say. The teacher must shed this parental role as dispenser of rewards and punishments; he has only to quit exploiting sibling rivalry to get right answers. It is ridiculously naive to construe as learning fervor the desperate efforts of children to find psychic security.

With rare exceptions most of what currently passes for 'class discussion' are actually serial dialogues between teacher and student A, then student B, etc. The model for this kind of exchange is the furniture arrangement--a block of little desks all facing the teacher's desk, which is isolated in front. The assumption seems to be that students can learn only from the teacher. There are several faults in the assumption and in that kind of conversation. For one thing, the proper development of thought requires other operations than question and answer--those corresponding, for example, to the additive, adversative, conditional, and concessive constructions of language. And usually the student is on one end only of the operation, the answer end. Think too of the multiplicity of attitudes represented by any mixed class of 20 or 30 students--the range of points of view and emendations going to waste. These do not have to be emitted by a teacher, and indeed often they could not be. Furthermore, emendation by the authority figure frequently elicits resistance because the student may associate it with "big people always trying to tell you what to do--even what to think."

What the group discusses may be a book they have read in common, a student paper, an improvisation or performance by some of its members, an abstract topic of general interest, or many other things. I am concerned here with <u>how</u> they talk, with honing a fine cognitive tool out of extemporaneous conversation. The

teacher's special talent, for which he must be trained, is to play a dialogue by ear and exploit the unforeseen twists and turns of it to explore all those things that textbooks ineffectually try to present to students in an exposition. I am referring to what is generally called rhetoric, style, logic, semantics, grammar, literary form, and composition. No matter how naive and unsophisticated, the spontaneous remarks of students about a theme or a literary work are really about one or more of these sub-topics of discourse. What a student of language needs is not external facts but more insight about what he and his peers are doing verbally and what they could be doing. The teacher's knowledge of linguistics, semantics, or literary form, say, must influence the student. But the best method of influence is dramatic, not expository. The teacher's art is to open up the whole range of external, social operations that will lead to internal, cognitive operations. He does this by getting students to feed back to each other. Once they are independent of him, he may inject more of his experience into the conversation, but such monologues should arise directly from their dialogue and can't be planned. The group should collaboratively forge serviceable abstractions and thus enable each member to do so alone. Under 'panel discussion' I will discuss in more detail some qualities of good dialogue.

In the activity I am calling dramatic improvisation the method is to select two or three students, give them the floor and a minimal situtation, then ask them to make up a conversation as they go along. A minimal situation might be that A is a parent, B a child, and B is making an excuse of some kind. Both teacher and students can think of situations. Younger children might need to be given a definite role, identity, relationship and circumstances; older children with previous experience might need only an abstract assignment ("you want

him to stay and you want to leave"). Situations might be chosen that foreshadow those in a play the students will soon read. The teacher can 'cast' by either matching or contrasting the personality of the student with that required by the role. Or roles and relations can be defined only socially, leaving personalities as blanks to be filled in by the actors. Sometimes the teacher might stop the actors at a certain point to replace one of them or to reverse roles: the resulting changes in dynamics can be discussed by the witnessing portion of the class and related to the awareness aspect of the workshop conversations.

There are several purposes of dramatic improvisation. Begun at an early uninhibited age, extemporizing of this sort can head off later self-consciousness, make verbalization easy and natural, increase presence of mind, and develop inventiveness. But this is only a basic discursive facilty, a loosening of tongue and limbering of wit. More specific goals are to foster the ability to: (1) listen closely and react directly to an interlocutor, (2) devise ad hoc rhetorical ploys for getting certain effects and results, (3) simulate the language, voice, and manner of some one of a certain type or role, (4) shift roles, attitudes, and points of view--stand in others' shoes, (5) feel from the inside the dynamics that make up a theatrical scene, and (6) act out and express real feelings in a situation made safe by the pretense that "I am being someone else."

Performing planned plays, either professional or student-written, is a natural concomitant of improvising. Improvisation should make acting performances better, but performance creates new problems, such as memorizing the script and blocking the action, that are peculiar to planned drama. Although rehearsals take more time, they are more worthwhile than sight readings, which

are rendered rather ineffectual by stumbling reading and being encumbered with the script. Short one-acters written by students would often serve well, and subsequent discussion of the performance could relate acting to writing. Putting on professional plays makes for more effective and pleasurable literary study than reading them, at least until students have had enough experience participating and witnessing to be able to bring the script to life in their mind. The non-verbal aspect of drama can be emphasized through pantomime. If the spectators write down, just after a pantomime performance, what they think it was they witnessed, they can discuss their different interpretations and relate these differences to ambiguities in the acting and to idiosyncracies of recording. Last, performing a play offers the same opportunities as improvisation to play different roles, to attitudinize, and to develop fluency but may be an easier way for some because the words and deeds are already given.

Panel discussion is another kind of oral improvisation, designed to exploit the inherent relation between dialogue and dialectic. It is a dramatic method of developing intellectual powers. The model for it is a kind of socratic dialogue without the omniscient Socrates. Two, three, or four students are given the floor and asked to discuss a topic chosen by the class or derived from some speciality of their own, or arising out of class writing and reading. Panel discussions may substitute sometimes for workshop discussion and are also training for it. The small size of a panel ensures that each member participates and gets response to what he says. The process of feeding back and expatiating can be sharpened in trios and quartets and then transferred to the larger group discussions. Also, the witnessing portion of the class is provided with a detached relationship to the communicants and their ideas; this

should make for calmer assessment of the ideas presented and greater awareness of dynamics in the large group. When the panel is over, the spectators can discuss both the dialectic and the drama of the panelists. But most of all, the purpose of a panel is to promote the social art of conversing and the intellectual art of qualifying. My hypothesis is that the right kind of dialogue will teach so-called exposition and argumentation better than years of premature belaboring on paper.

Let me be very clear about 'right kind of conversation.' Many teachers equate discussion with head-on contention. A 'hot debate' is considered ideal even if it is a deadening clash of fixed ideas or a feverish struggle of egos. Cognitive development requires a lot more than sheer contention, which represents only the adversative operation and which frequently just solidifies everyone's ideas. Good discussion is chiefly qualifying statements, looking for what one <u>can</u> accept in an assertion and determining what one <u>cannot</u> accept. There is practically no statement one can think of that does not have some truth potential if properly qualified. The art is to stipulate the exact conditions under which some proposition <u>is</u> true, starting perhaps with the time, place, people, and circumstances to which it actually applies; then to quantify it (<u>all</u>, <u>some</u>): then to amend it with conditional, concessive, and proviso clauses. Vapid conclusions such as "it all depends on the individual" and "it's just a matter of semantics" are no substitute for trying to tailor a linguistic utterance to fit the reality one is talking about.

Good discussion also includes the 'rules of evidence.' Besides qualification, the only process that makes the difference between sound argumentation

and a boring reiteration of opinions is invoking some material or logical reasons for accepting a statement. Evidence may be a narrative or anecdote, a syllogism, or a citation of some authoritative judgment or finding. The presence or absence of evidence, the nature of it, and the validity of it should become issues in the panel and in the group discussion after a panel.

Although formal debate as practiced by clubs and diplomats may help teach the presenting of evidence, I'm afraid I must take a strong stand against this kind of discourse in education. When someone is assigned in advance a position to champion, come hell or high water, the main point quickly becomes contention, not the search for truth. Formal debate is a game of oneupmanship, an unproductive duel of personalities. The goal is to overwhelm the opposition, not to enlarge one's mind. In my experience, debating societies always include in their membership the most dogmatic students in a school, who are drawn to such an activity because it offers an easy identity and an outlet for their talents of rationalization. It is true that part of debating is to learn to argue either side and to foresee the opponent's arguments, but this incorporation of the other's point of view is much better accomplished when one is not obliged by a prior investment to defend against that other point of view. I have several other objections to formal debating: both the dualistic format and the yes-or-no wording of topics cast issues in a crude either-or way that militates against relativistic thinking; the two parties often do not talk to the same point because their speeches are prepared; there is no feedback or interaction except in the rebuttal; and the speakers are in effect learning to ignore and talk past each other, an all too common trait of everyday conversation and diplomacy.

I am of course not trying to kill controversy. People do have and will maintain points of view in which, for one reason or another, they have an investment. What needs to be fostered, partly through controversy, is multiplicity of ideas, fertility, choice. The principle I am invoking is the old open-market-of-ideas concept. A two-valued, prestructured, pre-committed discourse does not live up to this principle. As an adversary game like chess or tennis debate is fine, but it should not be a model for learning dialogue, which must include more than the adversative. Taking a position is not difficult and hardly needs to be taught; it comes to us readily with our natural egocentrism and ethnocentrism. What takes learning is the sense of alternative possibilities and the reasons for choosing one over another. Real truth-seeking has always been a collaboration of receptive minds; it requires a willingness to be influenced, reciprocity, which is a strength not a weakness. It is the lack of this honest ingredient that leads to so many international deadlocks: one wants to manipulate the other fellow and remain unchanged oneself. This sort of 'debate' is mere propaganda. Certainly the social needs of the future will exact a superior kind of dialogue than we have taught and learned in the past. The threat that collaborative conversation poses to the ego is loss of identity, but it is patent that identity can and must be based on something more enduring than a certain ideological stance.

The last of the vocal activities is monologuing. When a student has become fluent in the give and take of conversation he should be induced to detach himself from the group and to talk alone. Giving a prepared speech is an act of composition followed by a reading; as such it is farther advanced than what I have in mind here--a kind of spontaneous monologue that would prepare for

composition. As a gradual weaning, I suggest letting individuals take over the conversation for longer and longer durations, to supply anecdotes or special knowledge they may have about some aspect of a subject that is before the group. If the discussion is on transportation, the child of a bus driver might be asked to relay things his father has told him. The individuals would be asked to summarize a panel or group discussion, a more difficult organizing task than telling a narrative. Reading aloud one's written composition is also an easy habituation to monologuing. With more meaningful ground rules, the show-and-tell sessions could also serve to develop powers of monologue. That is, a student who has brought something to class is somewhat in the expert's position and therefore a logical monologuist, but without involved questions from his peers he may just mutter a few words and the matter will end with "How nice." There is no reason for show-and-tell not to continue into the later years. As strong hobbies and competencies grow, older children will have a lot more to say about the things they bring in--how they work, the history, procedures, etc.--things that provide a natural outline of an extended utterance but that don't need to be prepared. It is better to let the student present his information spontaneously and for him to learn, through questions and other feedback, what might have been a better way to organize what he had to say. Such a monologue could serve as the base for a written piece later.

I think it is clear how drama, narrative, exposition and argumentation can be learned in some measure without writing a word, through oral improvisation. The oral activities are basic but not in the sense of being limited to elementary school alone. I think they should be interwoven with writing throughout secondary school as well. The activities I am going to take up

now would constitute some of the child's first writing but would also recur as later assignments too. In rough summary these activities are two--eye-witness recording and playwriting. Of course, considered as productions by one individual both are monological; that is, the student must enchain the utterances by himself. But both recording and invented dialogue are based on the same enchainment--time order of occurrence, the simplest of all. "Then. . . then." Then I see this. Then he says this. The difference is that an eye-witness has less decisions to make about what to put down than a playwright, because the events are given and not invented.

For recording, the student is placed in an observer relation to some phenomena and asked to dictate or write down what he registers with his senses at a particular time and place. The result is a kind of perceptual soliloquy, either in the form of telegraphic notations or of more leisurely sentences. The key tense is the progressive present; the student is verbalizing as he registers, and that is the definition of recording. The records thus produced are aimed at no other audience than himself and are not to be judged as communications, which they do not purport to be.

The three-fold purpose is to develop powers of observation, produce material that can subsequently be re-written for an outside audience, and to learn to abstract sensations into words. Perceptual abstraction is the first stage of symbolizing experience and a necessary condition for thinking and writing. Many so-called writing faults, such as lack of detail, lack of example, indiscrimination, and inaccuracy are traceable to poor observation. Starting with raw sensory data well nigh eliminates stale imitation and thus increases

originality. Also, in order to become aware of how he processes information all the time, the student needs to examine all phases of his abstracting. Selected, and told from a later point of view, a record becomes a narrative of either a personal or scientific sort. Or the notations can become the stage directions and action of a play. A sound record among people may produce an actual dialogue. In other words, a recording may be used almost as is or may be abstracted to further levels for different purposes and audiences. The student learns that material for writing is all around him at any given moment. The problem of pre-writing--finding subjects and treating them in stages that lead to a finished product--can be solved, I believe, by spontaneous recording, which is another kind of improvisation.

The stimuli for recordings can be provided to some extent within the classroom, for children young enough to need such structuring, but ultimately it is desirable for students to choose a time and place outside of class to do their recording. Animals, mechanical contraptions, science demonstrations, pantomimists--anything that moves--can serve in the structured situation. The shift from teacher-selected to student-selected stimuli can accompany a shift from isolated senses to interplay of senses. That is, first a student is asked to record what he hears only, or sees or touches, of what is presented in school, and then to record all his sensations somewhere away from school.

Students unable to write can dictate their verbalized sensations to the teacher or to older students. In fact, it might be better for any student who is concentrating on sounds or touch to close his eyes and dictate to a partner who would then trade places with him. The dictation itself can be a strong learning device, since it entails breaking the flow of speech sounds into words

and other units: spelling, punctuation, and accuracy of quotation can then be gone over together by the partners. This practice can be related in turn to recording dialogue. Expedients have to be devised for somehow capturing events that happen too fast to keep up with otherwise. The problem is the same for someone recording sights and sounds as it is for someone playing stenographer; both are in a sense taking dictation. By reading and discussing their records, students can explore telegraphic and fuller styles, the best ways to capture sensations hurriedly, options of word choice, and the degree of dispensability of different parts of speech. They can also discuss the advantages of composing after the fact and the kind of re-writing that would be required to make a record understandable and interesting to another audience.

In fact, a teacher can exploit recording for virtually anything he wishes to teach--linguistics, semantics, point of view, description, narrative. By varying the speed and conditions of the assignment he can bring different linguistic structures under scrutiny. By asking several students to record at the same time and place he can work with the different ways students named the same phenomena, and with differences in their perceptual selection, and differences in their physical vantage points. Recordings made by the same student at the same place but at a different time can be compared also. If students are asked to spot non-sensations in their own and others' recordings, they become adept at separating physical fact from inferences and interposed attitudes--or at least at discovering the subtle interrelations of these things. They should be led to contemplate the way what we see is influenced by our wants, prior interests, and conventions--how concept influences percept. Since the order of utterances is determined by the order of events, recordings are

thoroughly narrative but in two ways. An active scene bombards the observer with an external order of events, whereas a still-life tableau forces the observer to fall back on the order of his own body movements. That is, contrary to what composition texts say about static description, there is no such thing as spatial order. Only time can order in the physical world. The order of items in a still-life description is determined by the observer's attentional sequence--either his movement in that space, the movement of his head and eyeballs, or the idiosyncracies of his perceptual selection, which may be partly conceptual. In short, we have a narrative of external events beyond the observer's control or a narrative of the observer's actions themselves.

Students ready to look inward somewhat can be asked to record, first, their internal sensations, then their flow of memories, then their flow of thoughts. Many young people, and adults, are unaware of what they are feeling, kinesthetically and emotionally, until they consciously turn attention inward to the organs and other parts of the body. Then they notice little aches, itches, and muscular tensions, or emotions as manifested by physical sensations. Next, using immediate surroundings as stimuli to trigger past sensations, the student begins writing down trains of memories and, eventually, trains of thought associations. Although memories concern what happened, and reflections concern what happens or may happen, the act of remembering or reflecting is a part of what is happening now, and like any other events of the present can be recorded as it goes on. The gradual shift of focus inward is one curriculum progression; another is the sensations-memory-reflections sequence, which mounts the abstraction ladder of symbolic activities.

The inner verbal stream called soliloquy is really a mixture of currents, but by focusing attention on one of these currents we can make it nearly exclude the others, temporarily. This happens naturally all the time--as inner and outer events "call attention to themselves"; what the teacher's assignment does is act as an outside influence that helps the student tap these currents for their rich and individualistic materials. Furthermore, a lot of the stream is actually sub-verbal or perhaps unconscious and does not really become soliloquy until an effort of attention brings it to the word level.

Taking dictation, recording behavior, and improvising dramas and panels should all ease the way to play writing in two ways. One is in training the eye to note behavior and the ear to note speech; the other is in getting a sense of responsiveness and interplay among people. Trying to write plays should further develop such faculties as well as making the reading of plays a much more meaningful experience. What I will outline here is a suggested sequence of assignments in dramatic writing.

A good beginning is to invent a short, unbroken conversation between two people, what I call a duologue. The point is to get something interesting going between the people without worrying too much about wrapping up the ending in a big climax. One kind of two-person drama is a monologue spoken to someone who does not speak. From this point of departure the student progresses to a triadic relationship, which is already a lot more difficult to handle, and then on to a longer scene that mixes duets, trios, and quartets. He is encouraged to try soliloquies. He is told to limit stage directions to what the audience can see and hear. This is to prevent the amateur tendency to tell how characters feel and to insert abstract information. A severer limitation is

to write the script with no stage directions, so that time, place, and circumstances must all come through the dialogue. In any case, until the student can write a dialogue for several voices that is indeed dramatic, it seems a good idea to hold the play to one continuous scene. This can produce one-acters, and even if the student stops here he has learned a lot. The next step is to write a play of several scenes. This complexity brings on problems of plotting and selection that approach similar problems in narrative. Which action is to occur offstage and which on? How is the offstage action to be summarized for the audience? Pacing also becomes more difficult along with the effective juxtaposing of scenes of different times and places. Whatever the degree of complexity, it is important that the writer draw his characters, action, and setting from a world he has some knowledge of: otherwise he draws on all the movies and TV shows he has seen.

Writing socratic dialogues can build a bridge from drama to essays of ideas. The student designates two voices as A and B and writes a dialogue between them about some topic he or the class has chosen. The topic might be something about what the class has been reading. This conversation is improvised straight off on paper for about a half hour. The purpose is to turn over a subject and get different points of view on it. Older students could work with three or four voices and afterwards re-write the dialogue as an essay by merging the voices into one but without eliminating any worthwhile arguments. This conversion of dialogue into essay requires that a student fuse separate statements by grammatically transforming them and relating them with appropriate conjunctives. This process is parallel to the internalization I spoke of as occurring in real conversation. Doing this alone on paper presupposes a lot

of oral experience. It asks, in effect, that the student bring out and put into play whatever points of view he has stored, without fear of contradicting himself. Then, in the essay, he assimilates the various arguments into a monological discourse, a feat which entails shifting his own point of view to a level of abstraction higher than that of any one of the arguments.

Before passing on to the receptive activities, I think I should make it clear that the purpose of asking students to write in play form, or in any other literary form, is not to engender hordes of little creative writers. My concern is greater for a curriculum that helps semi-literate, non-verbal types of children than one that f st rs the gifted. The very profound relationship that exists between literary and everyday discourse--some of which I hope I have demonstrated in this chapter--is such that to work in one is to work in the other. Nearly all the assignments I am recommending have multiple goals. A student who writes a play is learning how to converse, to appreciate an art form, to understand himself, to describe, and, very generally, simply to write. Let's look at these goals a moment.

To begin with the last, creating a play script allows a young student to write a lot of colloquial speech at a time when he is not ready to compose more formal sentences. He can write as people talk. Continuity and organization are relatively easy because the sequence of utterances need not be abstractly logical but can follow the familiar social give-and-take of conversation. And yet the writer is faced with the primary writing task of making sights out of sounds, of reproducing voice through orthography and punctuation. Writing dialogue is the best way to learn to punctuate. If it is clear that the script must enable someone else to read the lines as the author heard them

in his head when he wrote them, then the author knows he must use typography as a set of signals indicating to a reader where the stresses and pauses are and how the intonation goes. This is what the breaking and punctuating of sentences on the page is all about anyway. The rules are merely an attempt to generalize the relations between sound, syntax, and sense. But no one ever has trouble punctuating orally: the problem is rendering speech on the page. Children who don't learn how to punctuate in twelve years of rules could learn in a few weeks by having other students misread their own dialogues back to them. The problem is one of egocentrism: hearing in his own head the correct intonation and pauses of an utterance he is writing, the author doesn't realize that someone else is likely to impose a different reading unless he is guided by typographical cues. Overcoming such egocentrism requires, first, an awareness of what he is hearing himself, and then an awareness that the other person does not know what he knows. Both spelling and punctuation can be worked on by sub-groups of students reading and diagnosing each other's dialogues--once the teacher has focused them, with some examples, on the real issues involved. A language teacher is not a proofreader and should never become one.

Stage directions are a combination of narrative and description. The referents are physical. Although the narrative part can follow chronological order, and is central to the action, the description is intermittent and accessory, as is the case for description generally. Above all, therefore, it must be relevant and significant, well selected and well timed. A natural criterion is that the physical appearance of a character or a setting should relate to the action and to the author's purpose. What should the order of items, and therefore of utterances, be when telling how something looks when

it does not move? This is a good task and one that goes beyond the logic of time.

All I will say about learning to converse through playwriting is that anyone who can write dialogue can say it, and that inherent in creating a drama is the relinquishing of egocentric speech for socialized speech.

Understanding art and understanding oneself I want to take together and apply beyond drama, for the sake of a general educational principle, which is to let students write their own literature. Although one very reasonable argument for this principle is that students can often write better and more appropriate reading material for each other than is manufactured for them by some adult writers of primers, my case rests on a couple of more important beliefs. They are that a student who role-plays the artist (1) comes to appreciate and understand the art form intuitively without needing teacher explanation and tedious vivisections and post-mortems, and (2) that some of the benefits that accrue to the artist accrue to him. Anyone who has written some duologues and triologues, or one-acters, or a whole play is much more likely to grasp for himself what the dynamics is of a certain moment in Ibsen or Shakespeare, what is the main vector of a certain scene, or its purpose, why some scenes occur offstage and some on, how people's speech characterizes them, the importance of setting and objects, what is a clumsy or expert exposition, and so on. The same is true with fiction and poetry. Most inexperienced students take all the decisions of the artist for granted. In fact, they see no choice, only arbitrariness or inevitability. Appreciation of form comes only with a sense of the choices--from the selection of persona, locale, and events to who goes offstage when and what gesture accompanies which speech.

When you yourself invent, you see all the choices, make decisions: the arbitrariness and inevitability of what professionals do disappears. It all begins to make sense. You are on the inside of the game, and it is more fun to play this way. When you discuss a professional play in class, you are motivated to talk about how the author says what happens by presenting what is happening. Becuase you know what he is doing, you know what he is saying.

The benefits an artist enjoys concern the exploitation and controlling of his fantasies for an objective connection and for self-knowledge. Fantasies are one kind of abstracting, and the purpose of abstracting is to reduce reality to something manageable. Children, like adults, make their way in the world and among their own feelings by creating some abstractions that help manage. They will fantasy anyway: all the teacher is asking them to do is shape some of these fantasies in words and forms, which are public. An artist externalizes his fantasies, sells them for profit, and at the same time gets a chance to examine them and have them examined. All people seem to feel a vital need to find correspondences, 'objective correlatives,' between mind and world. Perhaps this is partly in order to get in touch with less conscious parts of themselves, but it is partly, I think, just to connect for its own sake. To plug inner experience into outside equivalents seems to be of profound importance for human beings. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the addiction both children and adults have for stories, in whatever medium. Instead of merely projecting <u>into</u> someone else's inventions, the artist projects his own. The advantage is greater personal accuracy and appropriateness of fantasy to feeling. One of the benefits to the student as artist, then, is creating symbols through which to correspond with the outside world, and by

which he can learn about himself. Once externalized in public, i.e. impersonal, forms, ideas and feelings can be dealt with, changed, and resolved. For less verbal children such expression may be more important than for the talented.

Creating fictions, imaginatively recombining real elements, is thinking. The fact that these elements may be characters, events, and objects does not make a literary construction less an act of thought than any other kind of abstraction. Art is simply a different mode of abstracting. It is a great mistake for the teacher to imagine an opposition between 'creative' writing and idea writing. The ideas in plays and novels may not be named, as in exposition, but they are there. They are implicit in the selection, arrangement and patterning of events and character. The art is to embody ideas. And the child's first grasping of ideas is through embodiments of them. A student writing a play automatically makes it a way of saying something; there has to be something determining his choices. Whereas recording grounds discourse in reality, inventing allows a student to recombine things in ways he has not witnessed and thus opens the realm of possibility. This is the precursor for advanced logic, which consists of permuting knowns so as to arrive at unknowns.

Of the three input activities two have already been dealt with above--listening and witnessing. When some students are improvising a drama or panel, or performing a play, the others are looking on. Recording, taking dictation, and interacting in conversation all develop alertness and receptivity. I need add only the important experience of listening to tapes and discs and watching films. Professional recordings and films of plays are of course an excellent way to bring alive dramatic literature, but there is another kind of drama that

has seldom been tapped for classroom use. It is the ceaseless production of court rooms, hearings, senate committee investigations, and actual panel discussions. These are not only dramatic in the general sense but also often downright theatrical. They illustrate beautifully the tight relation between interplay of roles and personalities and the dialectic of ideas. At the same time as important ideas are being seriously dealt with, the dynamics of groups are forcefully enacted. I think that curriculum builders should make a great effort to obtain transcripts, tapes and kinescopes of these real-life dialogues. These could be heard, seen, and read in conjunction with the performing and reading of dramatic literature. Students should understand clearly both the similarities and differences between everyday, spontaneous dialogues and composed, literary plays. Though the theater simulates real behavior, at some degree of remove, it also harmonizes, resolves, relates, and transforms it. While seeing the unreality of realism, the artifice of art, the student can at the same time appreciate the organic relevance of plays to life.

Reading a play alone should occur only after improvising and performing plays and should be interwoven with the writing of dramatic pieces and the witnessing of professional performances. Until a student has had the experience of hearing and seeing plays, and being in them, that enables him to bring the script alive in his imagination, the reading of plays is not very rewarding and creates unnecessary problems of incomprehension. The failure of most play teaching is due to this lack of preparation. The text of a play leaves the reader more on his own than most narratives, which describe, guide and explain more. A script requires a lot of inference. On the page, a young reader

doesn't 'see' where X is standing when he is delivering a certain line, or who he is saying it to, or which actions are taking place concurrently. Nor does he 'hear' the significant inflections or tones of voice. If this is so for modern plays, it is true a fortiori for Shakespearean texts, which have few stage directions. Generally, no narrator provides continuity between scenes or says what people are thinking or hints at their motives. Recordings are especially useful in bringing dialogue itself alive, since the students can follow the script as they listen. When films and recordings are unavailable, teachers and other adults can work up a reading to present to the class. A rough sequence, then, is from the boards to the book, but always returning to the boards (or film or tape) as often as possible.

Once launched into reading, however, a more specific sequence is possible, the one outlined for the writing of plays. It goes from simple to complex but not by dint of extracting parts from plays. In fact, the idea is never to assign anything less than a complete play but to choose, in the beginning, whole short plays that in effect constitute the building blocks of larger, more complex plays. That is, find works of dramatic literature that are monologue, duologue, or triologue unfolding continuously at one time and place. These are one-scene plays limited to very few voices and hence to a simpler psychological dynamics. From this point progression is toward increasing number of voices and relations, more complex orchestration of groups of voices, and increasing extension of the action in time and space. The farther-flung a play--the more scenes it has occurring at different times and places and the larger the cast--the more the play becomes narrative and expository. That is, plot

becomes more important, interim action must be summarized, the relations of scenes made clear, the identities of new characters conveyed, and their relevance explained. Whereas the more here-now the more dramatic.

If we include within drama a lot of poetry that purports to be a recording of persona voices speaking now--interior monologues, dramatic monologues, and duologues--we enlarge the repertory of whole short works. The test is whether they could be put on stage. Soliloquies like "Soliloquy of a Spanish Cloister," "Ode to a Nightingale," "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock," and "Ulysses"; dramatic monologues like "My Last Duchess," "The Ballad of the Goodly Fere," and "To His Coy Mistress"; mixed interior and dramatic monologues like Henry Reed's "Naming of Parts"; duologues like "Lord Randall," "Ulysses and the Sirens," "Ann Gregory," Reed's "Judging Distances," and "West-Running Brook" all could be performed. So long as the poem presents the unintroduced, uninterrupted transcription of what some characters are saying at a certain time or place or in certain circumstances, it is dramatic. Many poems are difficult for students to understand simply because they do not expect drama in a poem and immediately assume that the voice they hear is the author's and that he is philosophizing. "My Last Duchess," which even my bright 11th graders seldom understood on the page, would be very comprehensible if two people acted it out--one gesturing to a portrait and speaking about it while the other reacted with growing revulsion until he finally started prematurely down the stairs. In fact, some short stories are interior and dramatic monologues and differ from some of these poems only in being in prose. My point could best be made if the reader were to compare the text of "My Last Duchess" with that of Strindberg's

play "The Stronger" and George Milburn's story "The Apostate," each of which has one speaker and one silent reactor. When a work is clearly dramatic, it should be taught as such, regardless of the genre under which it is classified. And a lot of literature that could not be performed is better understood on the page if the student is used to characterizing and situating voices and to shifting from one voice to another.

Let me adumbrate a possible sequence of play readings. The selections below are meant only to illustrate: I have chosen plays that adult readers might be familiar with rather than plays necessarily appropriate for young readers. I have not sifted a lot of short plays aimed at pre-adolescent readers and do not know if good selections exist for them that could occupy the slots in the first half of this sequence. If not, I would say to let the students create their own equivalent literature. I do not include here any poems or short stories, but the reader can insert at the appropriate places some of the examples above or some of his own examples. The exact placement of interior monologue or soliloquy is difficult because it depends on the readiness of students to recognize internal discourse. Here I will assume a student reader old enough to understand soliloquy as a real phenomenon. The opening choice finesses this issue somewhat, since Emperor Jones is child-like enough still to 'think out loud' and to see outside what is really inside. Also, it is not a play that is strictly continuous in time, and admittedly this principle of time-space expansion is sometimes at odds with the principle of moving from single voice to multiple voice. But I think any sensible teacher will see that these two principles are to be exploited only in the measure that they make a realistic pathway for the student, not to be adhered to absolutely.

Emperor Jones, Eugene O'Neil (A duologue that quickly becomes an extended soliloquy in which imagined creatures people the stage)

The Stronger, August Strindberg (A monologue spoken to a listener who reacts wordlessly)

Hello, Out There, William Saroyan (Begins as solo that becomes a long duet that returns to solo. Man and girl duologue)

The Zoo Story, Edward Albee (A duologue between two men that lapses for long stretches into monologue)

Miss Julie, August Strindberg (A triangle of one man and two women but only two are together at a time. Essentially duologue of man and woman who lapse often into monolouge. Dance interlude but duration is unbroken)

No Exit, Jean-Paul Sartre (A full-blown triangle of man and two women. Often duologue but always influenced by presence of third party. Dynamics of triadic group)

Electra, Sophocles (Mother-son-daughter story but actually consists of serial duologues between Electra and five others: occasional triologue: ranges from stychomythia to soliloquy and narrative monologue)

Candida, Bernard Shaw (Husband-wife-youth triangle but includes minor characters and spans a whole day: broken into scenes: two settings)

The Glass Menagerie, Tennessee Williams (A mother-son-daughter triad broken up by catalyst of fourth character; one setting but covers weeks or months: whole play is a memory soliloquy by the narrator, resembling Emperor Jones)

The Master Builder, Henrik Ibsen (Husband-wife-girl triangle but this group interlocks via main character with another trio: several scenes but covers short period of time)

Macbeth, William Shakespeare (Complex of soliloquies, duologues and group dialogues, covering first a few hours then months and years)

A student who reads and writes his way through such a sequence is tracing the development of dramaturgy, not historically but structurally and psychologically. Structurally because the earlier plays, while complete in themselves, feature solely and then in combination the components of which the

later plays are made. Psychologically, because a sequence based on the changing interplay of voices can array the different dynamics of human interactions that occur as the number, sex, and kind of relationship change. Reading plays in some such order as this increases the student's awareness, I believe, of the fundamental kinds of discourse and psychological relations that make up what we call a play. Thus certain plays read earlier can be used to teach certain other plays read later: this obviates a lot of analysis and explanation. Furthermore, form and dynamics are timeless and provide an entree into plays of another era that might seem too remote to a present-day reader. Whereas a purely content approach may make it very difficult for a young person to relate to his own world the goings-on in Shakespeare or Ibsen, he can readily translate from one duet or triangle to another. I have often asked students to represent on the board with arrows or other graphic symbols the main action of a scene. They always found this a reasonable request. There is something structural about both human emotions and human interactions. That is, you can replace the content of a feeling or the content of an exchange with another and something will still remain the same--something like the pitch, vibration, or intensity of the feeling (whether it is love or hate, fear or elation) and in interaction, something like the pattern of energy, the lines of force. Once one is tuned into varieties of pitch and pace and lines of force, one is on to drama, because it is the intensities and vectors of energy that carry a play, and this affects the participants and the observers more than what the drama is about. We ride the momentum of a particular dynamic until another dynamic cuts across it.

A few thoughts more, before leaving drama, about its importance for teaching rhetoric and style particularly, and for teaching language generally.

For me 'rhetoric' refers to the ways one person attempts to act on another, to make him laugh or think, squirm or thrill, hate or mate. Unlike other animals, the human baby cannot for some time do for itself. During the first months of utter helplessness and the following years of extreme dependence, the child must get others to do for it. Thus we learn at the outset of life the tremendously important art of manipulating other people. This is the genesis of rhetoric--and it begins before we learn to speak. Crying soon becomes a means of summoning the milk supply or the dry diaper. Later the rhetorical repertory of the child includes vomiting, holding breath, throwing temper tantrums, evacuating inappropriately, whining, wheedling--and obeying. Acting on others through words is merely one species of instrumental behavior in general. Our talk about the world is in the world and of the world: the use of language is a motivated drama. So I assume that there is no such thing as a discourse without a rhetoric, however unconscious or naive it may be.

Now, although we are concerned here with acting on others through words only, the fact is that, as a specialization of general instrumental behavior, verbal rhetoric originates in mixture with other behavior--as on the stage--and only later, when we learn to monologue in writing, does it isolate itself. Certainly the child first uses and encounters rhetoric in the mixture called for by face-to-face confrontation. The guts of drama is rhetoric, people acting on each other; speech is featured but non-verbal influence is highly prized, to say the least. A play is a model of how the student, his parents, friends, and enemies do things to each other verbally and in conjunction with

gesture, voice, and movement. In a play the communicants are 'live,' existential; the personalities behind the words are the most real, the intentions and ploys the most evident. Everything is present. Drama is the perfect place to begin the study of rhetoric. Confronted with a written monologue--a novel, essay, or treatise--a student deals with a phantom by comparison. An essay has a speaker who in turn has motives and ways of acting on his audience. But this action-at-a-distance will be much harder to recognize and respond to if the student has not been long accustomed, through experience with drama, to link words to speakers to motives. Reading, witnessing, and discussing plays will sensitize him to rhetoric, and he should also practice it himself, in his own voice and in invented voices, by improvising, writing, and performing dramas. Even if our student is destined to write nothing more than notes to the milkman, or to discourse only orally, he can at least learn to do these things effectively, through a developed rhetoric, and become aware that what is bombarding him through the mass media issues from people who have designs on him. Although we enter school already with a rhetoric, it is of course naive and drastically inadequate to later communication needs. The function of the school is to extend the rhetorical repertory and to bind messages so tightly to message-senders that this relation will not be lost in transferring it to the page. What is too obvious to notice in conversation must be raised to a level of awareness that will permit this transfer.

Closely related to how A acts on B through words is A's choice of diction, phrasing, sentence structure, and organization--his style. The best preparation for discriminating styles on the page is to become attuned to them in person.

Reading is listening to somebody talk. This does not mean that we write in just the same ways as we talk, but simply that writing is monologuing. In fact, the special qualities of writing are best understood when seen as changes in diction, phrasing, sentence structure, and organization made, precisely, in order to adjust to the loss of sound, facial expression, gesticulation, feedback, collaboration and the other characteristics of conversation. Ideally, as one reads he would hear a voice and conjure a person who would be uttering it. This person would be someone capable of saying such things in such ways. To teach style I would emphasize the continuity between dramatic personae in plays and the admittedly paler personae who are the authors of written monologues.

One is unlikely, however, to detect stylistic differences if one hears no more than one style, just as one is not likely to detect phonetic distinctions made in other languages but not in one's own. This is another reason why students should be exposed in the classroom to a wide range of voices, dialects, and life styles, and why they should role-play different people. A style proceeds partly from a class and ethnic background, and partly from a role or stance, and partly from personal idiosyncracy. Some of style is conditioned and some is a matter of changing wishes, as when a writer decides to take a debonair, foreboding, or satiric posture with a certain essay but not with another. Differences precede choice and choice precedes style. A student asked to take such and such a role in an improvisation realizes that he should try to 'sound like' that persona. Writing dialogue requires differentiating the voices of various personae and applying the realistic criterion that words should match their speakers and the stances of the speakers. As I will discuss

in the next chapter, the voice of the personal narrator in fiction serves as a bridge between face-to-face vocalization and very 'impersonal' writing. The educational principle involved here is that a thoroughgoing attunement to the styles of voices in the here-now makes it possible later to 'hear' a style on the page. Also, out of a diverse dramatic experience the student can begin to develop choice, break through stereotyped conditioning, and create a voice that truly utters him.

As for teaching language generally, a dramatic pedagogy is superior to an expository one. It seems terribly misguided to me to tell about something to students when they are using that something every day of their lives. As a school subject, language is unique in this way. In fact, it is truly language only when it is being used. It is not really a something at all, it is an action going on in somebody's head or between people. Words in a book are mere paper and ink until someone starts to read them. And he reads them only by virtue of a prior social activity. The expository approach would prepare textbooks and workbooks that either tell him what he is already doing or tell him what he ought to be doing in his verbal behavior. Since this verbal behavior can be practiced in the same room in which it can be told or read about, the most sensible course, it seems to me, is to behave verbally and behave some more verbally about that behavior and thus modify and enlarge discourse in the ways the expository approach would have it. The prepared statements and exercises of textbooks never come at the right time to modify behavior; only something extemporaneous can do that. To read and be told about, at one time and place, how language works and how we should best use it, then to try to discourse for real at another time and place. . .well, to make such an application

and transfer presupposes an intellectual attainment that could only be the end not the means of an education. Correction and enlightenment 'take' best when they come right in mid-task, when the knowledge is just what one needs to know at that moment. Besides being irrelevant, exposition is dull. In other subjects it may to some extent be unavoidable if the subject is a corpus of facts which the student cannot know any other way. But the facts and possibilities of discourse can be known in another way, one more akin to how the student has been learning language and to how he will be using it out of school, only this dramatic method can be used with a consciousness and deliberateness denied to the home and the marketplace.

As much as teachers may often wish that they could ignore, eliminate, or stylize into innocuousness the sociality of the classroom, they neither should do so nor can they. Ultimately, a student, or adult for that matter, is more interested in his relation to other people than he is in a subject, because psychic survival and fulfillment depend on what kind of relation one works out with the social world. Since some life drives are at stake, no student is going to forsake this interest regardless of tough discipline; the teacher can't control his mind. He will get interested in the subject to the extent that he can make it relevant to his current needs. Instead of creating constant tension between the social motives of the student and his own motive to teach the 'subject,' the teacher would do better to acknowledge that his own intellectual pursuits are framed by dramatic relations between him and the world, and to recognize that this must be true for his students as well. Since discourse is ultimately social in origin and in function, it seems a shame to fight those forces that could be put to such excellent use in teaching the subject.